

E

381

.W358



Class \_\_\_\_\_

Book \_\_\_\_\_

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT





Issued Monthly  
September to June

Number 122

February 2, 1898

# RIVERSIDE LITERATURE SERIES

## THE GREAT DEBATE WEBSTER'S REPLY

EDITED BY  
LINDSAY SWIFT

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & COMPANY  
BOSTON, NEW YORK, AND CHICAGO  
The Riverside Press, Cambridge

Entered at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., as second-class matter

Single Numbers FIFTEEN CENTS  
Double Numbers THIRTY CENTS

Triple Numbers FORTY-FIVE CENTS  
Quadruple Numbers FIFTY CENTS

Yearly Subscription (9 Numbers) \$1.35

# The Riverside Literature Series.

*With Introductions, Notes, Historical Sketches, and Biographical Sketches.  
Each regular single number, paper, 15 cents.*

1. Longfellow's *Evangeline*.\* ††
2. Longfellow's *Courtship of Miles Standish*; *Elizabeth*.\*
3. Longfellow's *Courtship of Miles Standish*. DRAMATIZED.
4. Whittier's *Snow-Bound*, and Other Poems.\* †† \*\*
5. Whittier's *Mabel Martin*, and Other Poems.\*\*
6. Holmes's *Grandmother's Story of Bunker Hill Battle*, etc.\*\*
- 7, 8, 9. Hawthorne's *Grandfather's Chair: True Stories from New England History*. 1620-1803. In three parts.††
10. Hawthorne's *Biographical Stories*. With Questions.\*\*
11. Longfellow's *Children's Hour*, and Other Selections.\*\*
12. *Studies in Longfellow, Whittier, Holmes, and Lowell*. Outlines and Topics for Study.
- 13, 14. Longfellow's *Song of Hiawatha*. In two parts.†
15. Lowell's *Under the Old Elm*, and Other Poems.\*\*
16. Bayard Taylor's *Lars: a Pastoral of Norway*; and Other Poems.
- 17, 18. Hawthorne's *Wonder-Book*. In two parts.†
- 19, 20. Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography*. In two parts.†
21. Benjamin Franklin's *Poor Richard's Almanac*, etc.
- 22, 23. Hawthorne's *Tanglewood Tales*. In two parts.†
24. Washington's *Rules of Conduct, Letters and Addresses*.\*
- 25, 26. Longfellow's *Golden Legend*. In two parts.†
27. Thoreau's *Succession of Forest Trees, Wild Apples, and Sounds*.  
With a Biographical Sketch by R. W. EMERSON.
28. John Burroughs's *Birds and Bees*.\*\*
29. Hawthorne's *Little Daffydownilly*, and Other Stories.\*\*
30. Lowell's *Vision of Sir Launfal*, and Other Pieces.\* †† \*\*
31. Holmes's *My Hunt after the Captain*, and Other Papers.\*\*
32. Abraham Lincoln's *Gettysburg Speech*, and Other Papers.
- 33, 34, 35. Longfellow's *Tales of a Wayside Inn*. In three parts.††
36. John Burroughs's *Sharp Eyes*, and Other Papers.\*\*
37. Charles Dudley Warner's *A-Hunting of the Deer*, etc.\*
38. Longfellow's *Building of the Ship*, and Other Poems.
39. Lowell's *Books and Libraries*, and Other Papers.\*\*
40. Hawthorne's *Tales of the White Hills*, and Sketches.\*\*
41. Whittier's *Tent on the Beach*, and Associated Poems.
42. Emerson's *Fortune of the Republic*, and Other Essays, including *The American Scholar*.\*\*
43. *Ulysses among the Phæacians*. From W. C. BRYANT's Translation of Homer's *Odyssey*.
44. Edgeworth's *Waste Not, Want Not*; and *The Barring Out*.
45. Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome*.\*
46. *Old Testament Stories in Scripture Language*.
- 47, 48. *Fables and Folk Stories*. In two parts.†
- 49, 50. Hans Andersen's *Stories*. In two parts.†
- 51, 52. Washington Irving: *Essays from the Sketch Book*. [51.] *Rip Van Winkle*, and Other American Essays. [52.] *The Voyage*, and Other English Essays. In two parts.†
53. Scott's *Lady of the Lake*. Edited by W. J. ROLFE. With copious notes and numerous illustrations. (Double Number, 30 cents. Also, in *Rolfe's Students' Series*, cloth, to Teachers, 53 cents.)
54. Bryant's *Sella, Thanatopsis*, and Other Poems.\*
55. Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*. THURBER.\* \*\*
56. Webster's *First Bunker Hill Oration*, and the *Oration on Adams and Jefferson*.

Also, bound in linen \* \* 25 cents. \*\* 4 and 5 in one vol., 40 cents; likewise 6 and 31, 11 and 63, 15 and 30, 28 and 36, 29 and 10, 39 and 123, 40 and 69, 55 and 67, 113 and 42. † Also in one vol., 40 cents. †† 1, 4, and 30 also in one vol., 50 cents; likewise 7, 8, and 9; 33, 34, and 35.

The Riverside Literature Series

---

THE GREAT DEBATE  
BETWEEN HAYNE AND WEBSTER

THE SPEECH OF DANIEL WEBSTER

IN REPLY TO

ROBERT YOUNG HAYNE

EDITED BY

LINDSAY SWIFT

OF THE BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

Boston: 4 Park Street; New York: 11 East Seventeenth Street

Chicago: 378-388 Wabash Avenue

The Riverside Press, Cambridge

L 381  
10258

## CONTENTS.

PAGE

FAC-SIMILE OF A PAGE OF THE WEBSTER MANUSCRIPT, NOW  
IN THE BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING PORTION OF  
THE SPEECH, AS ACTUALLY DELIVERED.

SKETCH OF DANIEL WEBSTER . . . . . 103

SPEECH OF MR. WEBSTER IN REPLY TO HAYNE . . . . . 111

[No. 121 of the *Riverside Literature Series* contains the Speech of Mr. Hayne, an account of the Occasion of the Great Debate, and a reproduction of G. P. A. Healy's painting in Faneuil Hall, known as "Webster's Reply to Hayne," with a key to the portraits in the painting.]

Copyright, 1898,  
BY HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO.

*All rights reserved.*

L 381  
10258

The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.  
Electrotyped and Printed by H. O. Houghton and Company.

## PREFACE.


IN the preparation of the speech of Mr. Hayne the text of the Boston edition of 1830 (Carter & Hendee) has been mainly followed. Mr. Webster's speech as here printed is based on the edition of his Works published in 1851 (Little & Brown). In cases of doubt consultation has been had with the manuscript of the famous speech, which is now deposited in the Boston Public Library.

The reproduction of Mr. Healy's painting is likely to interest those who may never have the fortune to see the original picture in Faneuil Hall, Boston; and even the list of names of the eminent men and women who heard the Great Debate is a stimulus to recall so memorable an event.

I wish hereby to express my thanks to the Trustees and the Librarian of the Boston Public Library for their courtesy in permitting the use of the Webster manuscript. Mr. Calvin W. Lewis, of Boston, has generously permitted me to use his unpublished notes, which have grown out of many years' admiration and study of Daniel Webster, and I am deeply obliged to him for the courtesy.

L. S.

BOSTON, *December*, 1897.



NOTE. — When Mr. Webster made his famous Reply to Hayne, his friend, Joseph Gales, took shorthand notes: then Mr. and Mrs. Gales wrote out the speech *in extenso* from these notes; and Mr. Webster, having their report before him, elaborated and completed his utterances according to his own wishes. This result formed the "copy" for the text which was first printed in the "Daily National Intelligencer," a newspaper published in Washington by Gales and Scaton, in the issues of February 23, 25, and 27, 1850. Upon this text were based the subsequent editions, which appeared with as much promptness as was possible at that time; it is probable, however, that the full significance of the Great Debate was slow to dawn upon the people of this country.

The editor has selected the famous close of the Reply, partly because its solemnity and beauty never tire, but mainly because it shows, by contrast with the Gales version, the growth of the orator's own conceptions. It is a possibility that the reporter's attention may have been so swept off its feet that the notes do not represent Mr. Webster's actual words. However this may be, it is conceded that an orator has the right to treat his spoken words as any artist may his material, and refine upon them at his will. As Webster delivered his glowing words they must have had all the effect which the later refinement conveys to the eye by means of a perfected text. The contrast between the two versions is exceedingly instructive. The present editor, respecting this right of an orator to elaborate his printed words, has chosen the text revised by Mr. Webster himself toward the end of his life, and edited by his friend Edward Everett, although it differs often from Webster's own draught, which was always accessible.

[Facsimile of close of Webster's speech, as written out by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Gales, from the shorthand notes of Mr. Gales.]

and civil war. 'When my eyes shall be turned  
for the last time on the meridian sun, I hope  
I may see him shining <sup>bright</sup> upon my burial  
site and happy journey. I hope I shall not  
live to see his beams falling upon the shipwrecked



lies behind. Whether my eyes shall be turned,  
Glebe, & for the last time, ~~to~~ the pen in heaven,  
may I not see him "things on the broken  
I his human fragments, of a more glorious  
Union; on ~~that~~ dissonant, discordant, ~~but~~  
belligerent, on a loud note with "circular"  
or drunk, it may be, with paternal blood!

For their loose flexible slippers of glass, rather, I  
believed the gorgeous Emerald of the Columbia,  
~~their feet high at the end, their beings~~  
~~now known~~ shrouded over the whole coats, their  
feet high at the end, <sup>steamp</sup> at arm, ~~strophis, the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~, in  
~~and~~ their original center, ~~being, no longer~~



## SKETCH OF DANIEL WEBSTER.

As in the case of Benjamin Franklin, two States may claim the honor of being the home of Daniel Webster. He was born in New Hampshire; but his name is more closely identified with Massachusetts, where he lived in his later years, and where his body is buried. He was the son of Ebenezer Webster, who married, as a second wife, Abigail Eastman, and who lived in Salisbury, New Hampshire, where Daniel was born on January 18, 1782, — the fifth in lineal descent from Thomas Webster, the first-come from England of the family, which was supposed to be Scotch. It is essential to an understanding of Daniel Webster to remember that, though he was not of Puritan or Pilgrim stock, he was wholly an American, in whose make-up was no intermixture of alien blood.

The unusual abilities of Daniel and of his elder brother, Ezekiel, were probably transmitted from his father's mother, Susannah Bachelder, herself a descendant of the Rev. Stephen Bachelder, a man of unusual and eccentric parts. The superb physique of Webster's manhood was not indicated in his childhood, for he was so delicate as to be plainly unfitted for a farmer's toil, and was driven to outdoor life rather for amusement than for occupation. When fourteen years of age he went to the Phillips Exeter Academy, and in 1797 entered Dartmouth College, that veritable nurse of heroes. Though poorly fitted to enter college, he had studied the classics, after leaving Phillips Academy, with the Rev. Samuel Wood, of Boscawen. Any mention of Webster's early days should justly include an appreciation of the self-sacrifices made by his parents to secure an education for him and his brother, both of whom felt and

showed a proper gratitude. Daniel's rank was high at graduation; but his career at college was that of a lad of promise rather than that of a profound scholar. He found time during his course to write for a weekly paper in Hanover and to deliver a Fourth of July oration, in which are to be found in embryo the great political principles of his whole life, — devotion to country, loyalty to its Constitution, and the sentiment of nationality.

After graduation he studied law in the office of Thomas W. Thompson in Salisbury, but was soon obliged to teach school at Fryeburg, Maine, in order to help pay his brother Ezekiel's college expenses. In 1804 he was able to enter the law office of Christopher Gore, in Boston, where, in 1805, he was admitted to the bar. From Boscawen, where he began practice and where he found an unwelcome leisure, during which he wrote "An Appeal to the Old Whigs of New Hampshire" (1805), and other political contributions, he went in 1807 to Portsmouth. There he soon enjoyed a stimulating competition and helpful friendship with Jeremiah Mason, leader of the bar of Rockingham County, justly celebrated for the ability of its members.

The agitation which preceded the War of 1812 found Webster on the Federalist side, and he contributed with voice and pen to the controversy. He inherited his political preferences from his father; but he was by nature deeply though not narrowly conservative. He continued to hold a sort of modified Federalism, though, at the disappearance of the Federal party, he was forced to act with one of the several factions of the Democratic party until the definite formation of the Whig party. The "Rockingham Memorial," prepared by Mr. Webster in 1812, was addressed to the President, and is recognized as worthy of the author's abilities. In 1813 he first took his seat in the national House of Representatives. During the next few years he was building his legal reputation and becoming known in cases before the Supreme Court. In 1815 he moved to

Boston, and in 1818 argued the famous Dartmouth College case<sup>1</sup> before the Supreme Court.

The year 1820 found him active in the State Constitutional Convention of Massachusetts, where, with Judge Joseph Story, he took a most conspicuous and important part in all discussions. In December of the same year he delivered the first and one of the most celebrated of his great orations, — that on the two hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims. He reëntered Congress in 1823; and the year following, having been elected to the Nineteenth Congress by a vote of four thousand nine hundred and ninety out of five thousand votes thrown, he made his speech in the House on the appointment of a commissioner to Greece, then in the travail of her Revolution. In the years 1825 and 1826 were delivered two of his famous

<sup>1</sup> This famous case, before the Supreme Court, was virtually a contest between John Wheelock, formerly President of the College, and the Trustees, who had appointed the Rev. Francis Brown in Wheelock's place. The contest had developed into a party question in New Hampshire, the Democrats sustaining Wheelock and the Federalists the Trustees. Governor Plumer had appointed new trustees and overseers under a new law authorizing the reorganization of the college. The suit was brought by the original board against their former secretary, Judge Woodward, to recover the college seal and other property. Jeremiah Mason, Jeremiah Smith, and Daniel Webster (who had previously accepted a professional fee from Wheelock) appeared for the college before the Circuit Court. The case went against the plaintiffs, and was then taken up on a writ of error to the Supreme Court. Mr. Webster had against him William Wirt and later William Pinkney, then leader of the whole bar. The case was won largely by the wonderful force of Webster's oratory, and by the skill with which a court, a majority of which was at first hostile to the college, was brought to assent to the decision of Chief Justice Marshall, — that New Hampshire Legislature had impaired a contract, as the charter of the college to be within the Constitution. John M. Shirley's *Dartmouth College Causes* (1879).

orations, — the first on the laying of the corner-stone of Bunker Hill Monument, in the presence of Lafayette, and the second in commemoration of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. From 1827 to 1841, Mr. Webster sat in the Senate of the United States from Massachusetts, and the speech which is the occasion of the present volume was the first of his most considerable triumphs in that body. He then came forward as the protagonist of the Constitution in opposition to those attacks which were soon to take the form of openly proclaimed nullification. His reply to Calhoun, three years later, forms a fit companion speech to the reply to Hayne, though it is not so well remembered. This was the most active period of Webster's career, as is testified by his speeches on the constitutionality of the United States Bank, on the removal of the deposits, on the Sub-treasury plan, and on the South Carolina Ordinance of nullification. His renown as a lawyer was still further sustained by his part in the prosecution of the Knapp brothers in the White murder trial (1831).

Mr. Webster passed the larger part of 1839 in Europe, spending the summer and autumn in France and Great Britain, where he received gratifying evidence of the extent of his reputation. President Harrison offered him the choice of a place in his cabinet, and Webster selected the Secretaryship of State. At that time (1841) certain important matters called for the highest ability which the country could command in the direction of foreign affairs, particularly in regard to the New Brunswick and Maine boundary, and the right of search as claimed by England, — one of the questions left unsettled by the War of 1812. To his efforts, aided by the wisdom of Judge Story, is mainly due a successful issue to the tangled negotiations which resulted in the Treaty of Washington.

After a month in office Harrison died, and Tyler, who then became President, was so fortunate as to retain Webster in the cabinet in 1843, in the face of the resignation of

the other members. At no period of his life did Webster act with more independence and courage. It was at this time that he said: "I am, gentlemen, a little hard to coax; but as to being driven, that is out of the question."

Again elected to the Senate in 1844, his efforts were against the approaching war with Mexico, although he did not act in a sectional or contentious spirit. In 1846 (April 6 and 7) he made one of his strongest speeches in defense of the Ashburton Treaty, in which appeared his denunciation of Ingersoll of Pennsylvania. Close upon heavy personal bereavement came the chagrin of General Taylor's nomination. Disgusted with this event, Mr. Webster seemed to take an attitude toward slavery which made it wholly possible for him to part with the Whigs and to range himself as a leader of the Free Soilers, with whose declarations his own were now apparently in accord. So matters went up to the next great crisis in his career, and in reality the decisive one. The contention — during which he delivered his Seventh of March speech — was over the admission of California and New Mexico. By supporting the Compromise of 1850, he sought to avert a danger threatening, as it no doubt appeared to him, the very existence of the Union; he advocated the admission of California, anti-slavery constitution and all; the organization of New Mexico without the application of the Wilmot Proviso;<sup>1</sup> and a new Fugitive Slave Law, by which the slave might have the right of trial by jury. The effect of this speech is well known. The various causes which induced Mr. Webster to take the ground which he did are too complex for discussion here. The speech added nothing to Mr. Webster's strength, except in the South; but, as Mr. Lodge has said, the South was practical, and not in the least quixotic concerning candidates for the presidency. The manhood of the North mainly turned from Mr. Webster, concerning

<sup>1</sup> By the Wilmot Proviso, slavery was to be excluded from all territory thereafter acquired or annexed.

whose integrity there had long been uneasiness. Regarding his later attitude toward slavery this much is certain: there is no moral reconciliation between the Plymouth oration in 1820 and the speech of March 7, 1850. Furthermore, the period of his life best represented by the reply to Hayne is the highest point of his career. From that time there was a decline, sure if insensible, although his course in Tyler's cabinet was beyond criticism.

President Fillmore appointed Webster to the Secretaryship of State, and this office he held until his death. His last great address was at the laying of the corner-stone of the extension of the Capitol on the Fourth of July, 1851; and his last great legal contest was in January, 1852, over the Goodyear patent case, in which he was successful.

This year Mr. Webster failed to get the nomination of the Whig party, which was given to General Scott. He had been a candidate for twelve years and in four successive Whig conventions, but had been balloted for in only two, and his highest vote was only one ninth of the total cast. Mr. Webster was never popular, in the usual sense. In May, 1852, he was thrown from his carriage, and this accident, added to an organic disease and to the chagrin of losing what he felt to be his due, proved to be one cause of his death, which came on October 24 at Marshfield, where he had spent the summer in failing health.

In 1808 Mr. Webster had married Grace Fletcher, who bore him five children. One son, Charles, died in the Mexican War, and one, (David) Fletcher, was killed in battle near Bull Run, August 3, 1862. His second wife was Miss Caroline B. Leroy, whom he married in 1829, the year in which he lost his beloved brother Ezekiel.

Much has been written of Mr. Webster's imposing personal presence, and there is no doubt that in his earlier years this was impressive almost to the point of majesty. But in later life the perception of his relation to the rest of mankind became so distorted as to allow him at times

## SKETCH OF DANIEL WEBSTER.

to adopt a pomposity of manner that was, more than anything else, pathetic. His sense of humor alone would have saved him from this as a younger man, but that saving element seemed to become absorbed into the self-consideration which marked his declining years. The Hon. Mellen Chamberlain, in commenting upon certain phases of Webster's character, says : —

“He was a rustic, yet with marks of gentle blood in his shapely hands and feet, his well-proportioned limbs, and his high-bred face of no known type, unlike even his own brother, who was of Grecian form and face. We know that soil and climate affect character ; but it is not easy to accept, save as a poetic theory, the ‘pathetic fallacy’ with which Wordsworth imbued his generation and our own, that Nature has conscious relations with

‘Her foster-child, her inmate, Man,’

and forms his principles and regulates his methods of action agreeably to her own. But Daniel Webster was very like Nature. Like her, he was unethical ; like her, he was not revolutionary ; and, like her, he applied his powers along the lines of normal development.”

Webster's voice never lost the mellow quality which so stirred the audiences of his day ; and yet it is hard to believe that this was so large a factor as is generally supposed in the making of his reputation as an orator, when we consider the power which his words have possessed since his voice became still, and since the issues which called them forth have long been dead. Judge Chamberlain may well be quoted again as to the significance of Webster's oratory : —

“The inspiration of great endeavor is its immortality ; the potency of great achievement is its indestructibleness. The past assures the future. The discourses at Plymouth Rock and at Bunker Hill were not for an hour ; nor was the Great Reply. In the days of their utterance they were

## *THE GREAT DEBATE.*

endent, unprecedented eloquence ; but they spoke truest  
n they became wisdom to Lincoln and valor to Grant ;  
y rang loudest when heard along the front of battle,  
nd inspired deeds of immortal heroism on a hundred  
ields.”

# SPEECH OF MR. WEBSTER IN REPLY TO MR. HAYNE,

IN THE SENATE, ON FOOTE'S RESOLUTION,

TUESDAY AND WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26 AND 27, 1830.

MR. PRESIDENT, — When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence, and, before we float farther on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed; that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are. I ask for the reading of the resolution before the Senate.

The secretary read the resolution, as follows: —

“*Resolved*, That the committee on public lands be instructed to inquire and report the quantity of public lands remaining unsold within each State and Territory, and whether it be expedient to limit for a certain period the sales of the public lands to such lands only as have heretofore been offered for sale, and are now subject to entry at the minimum price. And, also, whether the office of surveyor-general, and some of the land offices, may not be abolished without detriment to the public interest; or whether it be expedient to adopt measures to hasten the sales and extend more rapidly the surveys of the public lands.”

We have thus heard, sir, what the resolution is which is actually before us for consideration; and it will readily occur to every one that it is almost the only subject about which something has not been said in the speech, running through two days, by which the Senate has been entertained by the gentleman from South Carolina. Every topic in the wide range of our public affairs, whether past or present, — everything general or local, whether belonging to national politics or party politics, — seems to have attracted more or less of the honorable member's attention, save only the resolution before the Senate. He has spoken of everything but the public lands; they have escaped his notice. To that subject, in all his excursions, he has not paid even the cold respect of a passing glance.

When this debate, sir, was to be resumed on Thursday morning [January 21], it so happened that it would have been convenient for me to be elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> The honorable member, however, did not incline to put off the discussion to another day. He had a shot, he said, to return, and he wished to discharge it. That shot, sir, which he thus kindly informed us was coming, that we might stand out of the way or prepare ourselves to fall by it and die with decency, has now been received. Under all advantages, and with expectation awakened by the tone which preceded it, it has been discharged and has spent its force. It may become me to say no more of its effect than that,

<sup>1</sup> In the Supreme Court, in the case of *Carver v. Jackson ex dem. Astor* (4 Peters, 1), better known as Carver's Lessees against John Jacob Astor. Mr. Webster and Greene C. Bronson, the Attorney-General for New York, were for the plaintiff, and David B. Ogden and William Wirt for the defendant. The defendant won.

if nobody is found, after all, either killed or wounded, it is not the first time in the history of human affairs that the vigor and success of the war have not quite come up to the lofty and sounding phrase of the manifesto.

The gentleman, sir, in declining to postpone the debate, told the Senate, with the emphasis of his hand upon his heart, that there was something rankling *here* which he wished to relieve. [Mr. Hayne rose and disclaimed having used the word *rankling*, but according to Gales and Seaton's "Register of Debates" the word was used.] It would not, Mr. President, be safe for the honorable member to appeal to those around him upon the question whether he did in fact make use of that word. But he may have been unconscious of it. At any rate, it is enough that he disclaims it. But still, with or without the use of that particular word, he had yet something *here*, he said, of which he wished to rid himself by an immediate reply. In this respect, sir, I have a great advantage over the honorable gentleman. There is nothing *here*, sir, which gives me the slightest uneasiness; neither fear, nor anger, nor that which is sometimes more troublesome than either, the consciousness of having been in the wrong. There is nothing, either originating *here*, or now received *here* by the gentleman's shot. Nothing originating *here*, for I had not the slightest feeling of unkindness towards the honorable member. Some passages, it is true, had occurred since our acquaintance in this body, which I could have wished might have been otherwise; but I had used philosophy and forgotten them.<sup>1</sup> I paid the honora-

<sup>1</sup> In the latter part of the preceding session, Webster had called upon President Adams for the instructions to the minis-

ble member the attention of listening with respect to his first speech; and when he sat down, though surprised, and I must even say astonished, at some of his opinions, nothing was farther from my intention than to commence any personal warfare. Through the whole of the few remarks I made in answer, I avoided, studiously and carefully, everything which I thought possible to be construed into disrespect. And, sir, while there is thus nothing originating *here* which I wished at any time or now wish to discharge, I must repeat also, that nothing has been received *here* which *rankles*, or in any way gives me annoyance. I will not accuse the honorable member of violating the rules of civilized war; I will not say that he poisoned his arrows. But whether his shafts were or were not dipped in that which would have caused rankling if they had reached their destination, there was not, as it happened, quite strength enough in the bow to bring them to their mark. If he wishes now to gather up those shafts, he must look for them elsewhere; they will not be found fixed and quivering in the object at which they were aimed.

The honorable member complained that I had slept on his speech. I must have slept on it, or not slept at all. The moment the honorable member sat down, his friend from Missouri [Mr. Benton] rose, and, with much honeyed commendation of the speech, suggested that the impressions which it had produced were too charming and delightful to be disturbed by other sentiments or other sounds, and proposed that

ters to the Congress of Panama. Though the resolution was defeated, Adams before March 4 sent the documents to the Senate. Hayne had somewhat strongly antagonized Webster and the administration in this matter.

the Senate should adjourn. Would it have been quite amiable in me, sir, to interrupt this excellent good feeling? Must I not have been absolutely malicious if I could have thrust myself forward to destroy sensations thus pleasing? Was it not much better and kinder both to sleep upon them myself and to allow others also the pleasure of sleeping upon them? But, if it be meant by sleeping upon his speech that I took time to prepare a reply to it, it is quite a mistake. Owing to other engagements, I could not employ even the interval between the adjournment of the Senate and its meeting the next morning in attention to the subject of this debate. Nevertheless, sir, the mere matter of fact is undoubtedly true. I did sleep on the gentleman's speech and slept soundly. And I slept equally well on his speech of yesterday, to which I am now replying. It is quite possible that in this respect, also, I possess some advantage over the honorable member, attributable, doubtless, to a cooler temperament on my part; for, in truth, I slept upon his speeches remarkably well.

But the gentleman inquires why *he* was made the object of such a reply. Why was *he* singled out? If an attack has been made on the East, he, he assures us, did not begin it; it was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Benton]. Sir, I answered the gentleman's speech because I happened to hear it; and because, also, I chose to give an answer to that speech which, if unanswered, I thought most likely to produce injurious impressions. I did not stop to inquire who was the original drawer of the bill. I found a responsible indorser before me, and it was my purpose to hold him liable, and to bring him to his just responsibility without delay. But, sir, this inter-

rogatory of the honorable member was only introductory to another. He proceeded to ask me whether I had turned upon him in this debate from the consciousness that I should find an overmatch if I ventured on a contest with his friend from Missouri. If, sir, the honorable member, *modestie gratiâ*, had chosen thus to defer to his friend and to pay him a compliment without intentional disparagement to others, it would have been quite according to the friendly courtesies of debate, and not at all ungrateful to my own feelings. I am not one of those, sir, who esteem any tribute of regard, whether light and occasional or more serious and deliberate, which may be bestowed on others, as so much unjustly withholden from themselves. But the tone and manner of the gentleman's question forbid me thus to interpret it. I am not at liberty to consider it as nothing more than a civility to his friend. It had an air of taunt and disparagement, something of the loftiness of asserted superiority, which does not allow me to pass it over without notice. It was put as a question for me to answer, and so put as if it were difficult for me to answer, whether I deemed the member from Missouri an overmatch for myself in debate here. It seems to me, sir, that this is extraordinary language and an extraordinary tone for the discussions of this body.

Matches and overmatches! Those terms are more applicable elsewhere than here, and fitter for other assemblies than this. Sir, the gentleman seems to forget where and what we are. This is a senate, a senate of equals, of men of individual honor and personal character and of absolute independence. We know no masters, we acknowledge no dictators. This is a hall for mutual consultation and discussion; not

an arena for the exhibitions of champions. I offer myself, sir, as a match for no man ; I throw the challenge of debate at no man's feet. But then, sir, since the honorable member has put the question in a manner that calls for an answer, I will give him an answer ; and I tell him that, holding myself to be the humblest of the members here, I yet know nothing in the arm of his friend from Missouri, either alone or when aided by the arm of *his* friend from South Carolina, that need deter even me from espousing whatever opinions I may choose to espouse, from debating whenever I may choose to debate, or from speaking whatever I may see fit to say on the floor of the Senate. Sir, when uttered as matter of commendation or compliment, I should dissent from nothing which the honorable member might say of his friend. Still less do I put forth any pretensions of my own. But when put to me as matter of taunt, I throw it back, and say to the gentleman that he could possibly say nothing less likely than such a comparison to wound my pride of personal character. The anger of its tone rescued the remark from intentional irony, which otherwise, probably, would have been its general acceptation. But, sir, if it be imagined that by this mutual quotation and commendation ; if it be supposed that, by casting the characters of the drama, assigning to each his part, to one the attack, to another the cry of onset ; or if it be thought that by a loud and empty vaunt of anticipated victory, any laurels are to be won here ; if it be imagined, especially, that any or all of these things will shake any purpose of mine, — I can tell the honorable member, once for all, that he is greatly mistaken, and that he is dealing with one of whose temper and character he has yet much to learn. Sir,

I shall not allow myself on this occasion, I hope on no occasion, to be betrayed into any loss of temper; but if provoked, as I trust I never shall be, into crimination and recrimination, the honorable member may perhaps find that, in that contest, there will be blows to take as well as blows to give; that others can state comparisons as significant, at least, as his own; and that his impunity may possibly demand of him whatever powers of taunt and sarcasm he may possess. I commend him to a prudent husbandry of his resources.

But, sir, the Coalition!<sup>1</sup> The Coalition! Ay, "the murdered Coalition!" The gentleman asks if I were led or frightened into this debate by the spectre of the Coalition. "Was it the ghost of the murdered Coalition," he exclaims, "which haunted the member from Massachusetts; and which, like the ghost of Banquo, would never down?" "The murdered Coalition!" Sir, this charge of a coalition, in reference to the late administration, is not original with the honorable member. It did not spring up in the Senate. Whether as a fact, as an argument, or as an embellishment, it is all borrowed. He adopts it, indeed, from a very low origin, and a still lower present condition. It is one of the thousand calumnies with which the press teemed during an excited political canvass. It was a charge of which there was not only no proof or probability, but which was in itself wholly impossible to be true. No man of common information ever believed a syllable of it. Yet it was of that class of falsehoods which, by continued repetition, through all the organs of detraction and abuse, are

<sup>1</sup> See the note on page 26 of Hayne's Speech regarding the alleged bargain between the friends of John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay.

capable of misleading those who are already far misled, and of further fanning passion already kindling into flame. Doubtless it served in its day, and in greater or less degree, the end designed by it. Having done that, it has sunk into the general mass of stale and loathed calumnies. It is the very cast-off slough of a polluted and shameless press. Incapable of further mischief, it lies in the sewer, lifeless and despised. It is not now, sir, in the power of the honorable member to give it dignity or decency by attempting to elevate it and to introduce it into the Senate. He cannot change it from what it is, an object of general disgust and scorn. On the contrary, the contact, if he choose to touch it, is more likely to drag him down, down to the place where it lies itself.

But, sir, the honorable member was not, for other reasons, entirely happy in his allusion to the story of Banquo's murder and Banquo's ghost. It was not, I think, the friends, but the enemies of the murdered Banquo, at whose bidding his spirit would not *down*. The honorable gentleman is fresh in his reading of the English classics, and can put me right if I am wrong; but, according to my poor recollection, it was at those who had begun with caresses and ended with foul and treacherous murder that the gory locks were shaken. The ghost of Banquo, like that of Hamlet, was an honest ghost. It disturbed no innocent man. It knew where its appearance would strike terror, and who would cry out, A ghost! It made itself visible in the right quarter, and compelled the guilty and the conscience-smitten, and none others, to start, with

“Prithee! see there! behold!—look! lo! . . .

If I stand here, I saw him.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, act iii. scene 4; the allusions

Their eyeballs were seared (was it not so, sir?) who had thought to shield themselves by concealing their own hand, and laying the imputation of the crime on a low and hireling agency in wickedness; who had vainly attempted to stifle the workings of their own coward consciences by ejaculating through white lips and chattering teeth, "Thou canst not say I did it!" I have misread the great poet if those who had no way partaken in the deed of the death either found that they were, or *feared that they should be*, pushed from their stools by the ghost of the slain, or exclaimed to a spectre created by their own fears and their own remorse, "Avaunt! and quit our sight!"

There is another particular, sir, in which the honorable member's quick perception of resemblances might, I should think, have seen something in the story of Banquo, making it not altogether a subject of the most pleasant contemplation. Those who murdered Banquo, — what did they win by it? Substantial good? Permanent power? Or disappointment, rather, and sore mortification; dust and ashes, the common fate of vaulting ambition overleaping itself? Did not even-handed justice erelong commend the poisoned chalice to their own lips? Did they not soon find that for another they had "filed their mind"? that their ambition, though apparently for the moment successful, had but put a barren sceptre in their grasp? Ay, sir,

"a barren sceptre in their gripe,  
Thence to be wrench'd with an unlineal hand,  
No son of theirs succeeding."<sup>1</sup>

to Banquo refer to this scene. The allusion to Hamlet's ghost is of course to Hamlet's father, whose name is mentioned in act i. scene 2, line 1, of the play.

<sup>1</sup> See *Macbeth*, act iii. scene 1. A most pointed allusion to

Sir, I need pursue the allusion no farther. I leave the honorable gentleman to run it out at his leisure, and to derive from it all the gratification it is calculated to administer. If he finds himself pleased with the associations, and prepared to be quite satisfied, though the parallel should be entirely completed, I had almost said I am satisfied also; but that I shall think of. Yes, sir, I will think of that.

In the course of my observations the other day, Mr. President, I paid a passing tribute of respect to a very worthy man, Mr. Dane of Massachusetts. It so happened that he drew the Ordinance of 1787,<sup>1</sup> for the government of the Northwestern Territory. A man of so much ability, and so little pretense; of so great a capacity to do good, and so unmixed a disposition to do it for its own sake; a gentleman who acted an important part, forty years ago, in a measure the influence of which is still deeply felt in the very mat-

Vice-President Calhoun's prospects for the presidency. It was already evident that Van Buren was Jackson's heir apparent, and shortly came the open breach between the President and the Vice-President.

<sup>1</sup> Bancroft's opinion, if sententious, is worth recalling: "Thomas Jefferson first summoned Congress to prohibit slavery in all the territory of the United States; Rufus King lifted up the measure when it lay almost lifeless on the ground, and suggested the immediate instead of the prospective prohibition; a congress composed of five Southern States to one from New England, and two from the Middle States, headed by William Grayson, supported by Richard Henry Lee, and using Nathan Dane as scribe, carried the measure to the goal in the amended form in which King had caused it to be referred to a committee, and, as Jefferson had proposed, placed it under the sanction of an irrevocable compact." *History of the United States* (1885), vi. 290. See also the notes on page 28 of Hayne's Speech.

ter which was the subject of debate, might, I thought, receive from me a commendatory recognition. But the honorable member was inclined to be facetious on the subject. He was rather disposed to make it matter of ridicule that I had introduced into the debate the name of one Nathan Dane, of whom he assures us he had never before heard. Sir, if the honorable member had never before heard of Mr. Dane, I am sorry for it. It shows him less acquainted with the public men of the country than I had supposed. Let me tell him, however, that a sneer from him at the mention of the name of Mr. Dane is in bad taste. It may well be a high mark of ambition, sir, either with the honorable gentleman or myself, to accomplish as much to make our names known to advantage, and remembered with gratitude, as Mr. Dane has accomplished. But the truth is, sir, I suspect that Mr. Dane lives a little too far north. He is of Massachusetts, and too near the north star to be reached by the honorable gentleman's telescope. If his sphere had happened to range south of Mason and Dixon's line, he might, probably, have come within the scope of his vision.

I spoke, sir, of the Ordinance of 1787, which prohibits slavery, in all future times, northwest of the Ohio, as a measure of great wisdom and foresight, and one which had been attended with highly beneficial and permanent consequences. I supposed that, on this point, no two gentlemen in the Senate could entertain different opinions. But the simple expression of this sentiment has led the gentleman not only into a labored defense of slavery, in the abstract and on principle, but also into a warm accusation against me, as having attacked the system of domestic slavery

now existing in the Southern States. For all this there was not the slightest foundation in anything said or intimated by me. I did not utter a single word which any ingenuity could torture into an attack on the slavery of the South. I said only that it was highly wise and useful, in legislating for the Northwestern country while it was yet a wilderness, to prohibit the introduction of slaves; and added that I presumed there was no reflecting and intelligent person in the neighboring State of Kentucky who would doubt that, if the same prohibition had been extended at the same early period over that commonwealth, her strength and population would at this day have been far greater than they are. If these opinions be thought doubtful, they are nevertheless, I trust, neither extraordinary nor disrespectful. They attack nobody and menace nobody. And yet, sir, the gentleman's optics have discovered, even in the mere expression of this sentiment, what he calls the very spirit of the Missouri question! He represents me as making an onset on the whole South, and manifesting a spirit which would interfere with and disturb their domestic condition!

Sir, this injustice no otherwise surprises me than as it is committed here, and committed without the slightest pretense of ground for it. I say it only surprises me as being done here; for I know full well that it is and has been the settled policy of some persons in the South, for years, to represent the people of the North as disposed to interfere with them in their own exclusive and peculiar concerns. This is a delicate and sensitive point in Southern feeling; and of late years it has always been touched, and generally with effect, whenever the object has been to unite

the whole South against Northern men or Northern measures. This feeling, always carefully kept alive, and maintained at too intense a heat to admit discrimination or reflection, is a lever of great power in our political machine. It moves vast bodies, and gives to them one and the same direction. But it is without adequate cause, and the suspicion which exists is wholly groundless. There is not, and never has been, a disposition in the North to interfere with these interests of the South. Such interference has never been supposed to be within the power of government ; nor has it been in any way attempted. The slavery of the South has always been regarded as a matter of domestic policy left with the States themselves, and with which the federal government had nothing to do. Certainly, sir, I am, and ever have been, of that opinion. The gentleman, indeed, argues that slavery in the abstract is no evil. Most assuredly I need not say I differ with him altogether and most widely on that point. I regard domestic slavery as one of the greatest evils, both moral and political. But whether it be a malady, and whether it be curable, and, if so, by what means ; or, on the other hand, whether it be the *vulnus immedicabile* of the social system, I leave it to those whose right and duty it is to inquire and to decide. And this I believe, sir, is, and uniformly has been, the sentiment of the North. Let us look a little at the history of this matter.

When the present Constitution was submitted for the ratification of the people, there were those who imagined that the powers of the government which it proposed to establish might, in some possible mode, be exerted in measures tending to the abolition of slavery. This suggestion would of course attract much

attention in the Southern conventions. In that of Virginia, Governor Randolph <sup>1</sup> said : —

“I hope there is none here who, considering the subject in the calm light of philosophy, will make an objection dishonorable to Virginia; that, at the moment they are securing the rights of their citizens, an objection is started that there is a spark of hope that those unfortunate men now held in bondage may, by the operation of the general government, be made free.”

At the very first Congress, petitions on the subject were presented, if I mistake not, from different States. The Pennsylvania Society for promoting the abolition of slavery took a lead, and laid before Congress a memorial praying Congress to promote the abolition by such powers as it possessed. This memorial was referred, in the House of Representatives, to a select committee consisting of Mr. Foster of New Hampshire, Mr. Gerry of Massachusetts, Mr. Huntington of Connecticut, Mr. Lawrence of New York, Mr. Sinnickson of New Jersey, Mr. Hartley of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Parker of Virginia; all of them, sir, as you will observe, Northern men but the last. This committee made a report, which was referred to a committee of the whole House, and there considered and discussed for several days; and being amended, although without material alteration, it was made to express three distinct propositions on the subject of slavery and the slave-trade. First, in the words of the Constitution, that Congress could not, prior to the year 1808, prohibit the migration or importation of such persons as any of the States then existing should think proper to admit; and, secondly, that Congress

<sup>1</sup> Edmund Randolph.

had authority to restrain the citizens of the United States from carrying on the African slave-trade for the purpose of supplying foreign countries. On this proposition our early laws against those who engage in that traffic are founded. The third proposition, and that which bears on the present question, was expressed in the following terms:—

“*Resolved*, That Congress have no authority to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them in any of the States; it remaining with the several States alone to provide rules and regulations therein, which humanity and true policy may require.”

This resolution received the sanction of the House of Representatives so early as March, 1790. And now, sir, the honorable member will allow me to remind him that not only were the select committee who reported the resolution, with a single exception, all Northern men, but also that, of the members then composing the House of Representatives, a large majority, I believe nearly two thirds, were Northern men also.

The House agreed to insert these resolutions in its journal; and from that day to this it has never been maintained or contended at the North that Congress had any authority to regulate or interfere with the condition of slaves in the several States. No Northern gentleman, to my knowledge, has moved any such question in either house of Congress.

The fears of the South, whatever fears they might have entertained, were allayed and quieted by this early decision; and so remained till they were excited afresh, without cause, but for collateral and indirect purposes. When it became necessary, or was thought

so by some political persons, to find an unvarying ground for the exclusion of Northern men from confidence and from lead in the affairs of the republic, then, and not till then, the cry was raised, and the feeling industriously excited, that the influence of Northern men in the public councils would endanger the relation of master and slave. For myself, I claim no other merit than that this gross and enormous injustice towards the whole North has not wrought upon me to change my opinions or my political conduct. I hope I am above violating my principles, even under the smart of injury and false imputations. Unjust suspicions and undeserved reproach, whatever pain I may experience from them, will not induce me, I trust, to overstep the limits of constitutional duty, or to encroach on the rights of others. The domestic slavery of the Southern States I leave where I find it, — in the hands of their own governments. It is their affair, not mine. Nor do I complain of the peculiar effect which the magnitude of that population has had in the distribution of power under this federal government. We know, sir, that the representation of the States in the other house is not equal. We know that great advantage in that respect is enjoyed by the slave-holding States; and we know, too, that the intended equivalent for that advantage, that is to say, the imposition of direct taxes in the same ratio, has become merely nominal, the habit of the government being almost invariably to collect its revenue from other sources and in other modes. Nevertheless, I do not complain; nor would I countenance any movement to alter this arrangement of representation. It is the original bargain, the compact; let it stand; let the advantage of it be fully enjoyed.

The Union itself is too full of benefit to be hazarded in propositions for changing its original basis. I go for the Constitution as it is, and for the Union as it is. But I am resolved not to submit in silence to accusations, either against myself individually or against the North, wholly unfounded and unjust; accusations which impute to us a disposition to evade the constitutional compact, and to extend the power of the government over the internal laws and domestic condition of the States. All such accusations, wherever and whenever made, all insinuations of the existence of any such purposes, I know and feel to be groundless and injurious. And we must confide in Southern gentlemen themselves; we must trust to those whose integrity of heart and magnanimity of feeling will lead them to a desire to maintain and disseminate truth, and who possess the means of its diffusion with the Southern public; we must leave it to them to disabuse that public of its prejudices. But in the mean time, for my own part, I shall continue to act justly, whether those towards whom justice is exercised receive it with candor or with contumely.

Having had occasion to recur to the Ordinance of 1787, in order to defend myself against the inferences which the honorable member has chosen to draw from my former observations on that subject, I am not willing now entirely to take leave of it without another remark. It need hardly be said that that paper expresses just sentiments on the great subject of civil and religious liberty. Such sentiments were common, and abound in all our state papers of that day. But this Ordinance did that which was not so common, and which is not, even now, universal; that is, it set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty

of government itself to encourage schools, and advance the means of education, on the plain reason that religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary to good government, and to the happiness of mankind. One observation further. The important provision incorporated into the Constitution of the United States, and into several of those of the States, and recently, as we have seen, adopted into the reformed Constitution of Virginia,<sup>1</sup> restraining legislative power in questions of private right, and from impairing the obligation of contracts, is first introduced and established, as far as I am informed, as matter of express written constitutional law, in this Ordinance of 1787. And I must add, also, in regard to the author of the Ordinance, who has not had the happiness to attract the gentleman's notice heretofore, nor to avoid his sarcasm now, that he was chairman of that select committee of the old Congress whose report first expressed the strong sense of that body that the old Confederation was not adequate to the exigencies of the country, and recommended to the States to send delegates to the convention which formed the present Constitution.

An attempt has been made to transfer from the North to the South the honor of this exclusion of slavery from the Northwestern Territory.<sup>2</sup> The jour-

<sup>1</sup> Adopted by convention on January 14, 1830, and ratified by the people in April of the same year.

<sup>2</sup> This refers to Mr. Benton, who again took up this portion of Mr. Webster's speech on May 21, and once more in his *Thirty Years' View*, vol. i. chap. xlv., wherein he convicts Webster of important errors, in particular showing that only six States voted in the affirmative (the vote of New Jersey remaining uncounted), and that only seven States were necessary to pass the anti-slavery clause.

nal, without argument or comment, refutes such attempt. The cession by Virginia<sup>1</sup> was made in March, 1784. On the 19th of April following, a committee, consisting of Messrs. Jefferson, Chase, and Howell, reported a plan for a temporary government of the Territory, in which was this article: "That, after the year 1800, there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in punishment of crimes whereof the party shall have been convicted." Mr. Spaight of North Carolina moved to strike out this paragraph. The question was put, according to the form then practiced: "Shall these words stand as a part of the plan?" New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania — seven States — voted in the affirmative; Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, in the negative. North Carolina was divided. As the consent of nine States was necessary, the words could not stand, and were struck out accordingly. Mr. Jefferson voted for the clause, but was overruled by his colleagues.

In March of the next year (1785), Mr. King of Massachusetts, seconded by Mr. Ellery of Rhode Island, proposed the formerly rejected article, with this addition: "And that this regulation shall be an article of compact, and remain a fundamental principle of the Constitutions between the thirteen original States and each of the States described in the resolve." On this clause, which provided the adequate and thorough security, the eight Northern States at that time voted affirmatively, and the four Southern

<sup>1</sup> In regard to the various cessions, see Hinsdale's *Old Northwest*, chaps. xii., xiii., particularly pp. 227-245 as regards Virginia.

States negatively. The votes of nine States were not yet obtained, and thus the provision was again rejected by the Southern States. The perseverance of the North held out, and two years afterwards the object was attained. It is no derogation from the credit, whatever that may be, of drawing the Ordinance, that its principles had before been prepared and discussed in the form of resolutions. If one should reason in that way, what would become of the distinguished honor of the author of the Declaration of Independence? There is not a sentiment in that paper which had not been voted and resolved in the assemblies and other popular bodies in the country over and over again.

But the honorable member has now found out that this gentleman, Mr. Dane, was a member of the Hartford Convention. However uninformed the honorable member may be of characters and occurrences at the North, it would seem that he has at his elbow on this occasion some high-minded and lofty spirit, some magnanimous and true-hearted monitor, possessing the means of local knowledge, and ready to supply the honorable member with everything, down even to forgotten and moth-eaten twopenny pamphlets, which may be used to the disadvantage of his own country. But as to the Hartford Convention, sir, allow me to say that the proceedings of that body seem now to be less read and studied in New England than farther South. They appear to be looked to, not in New England, but elsewhere, for the purpose of seeing how far they may serve as a precedent. But they will not answer the purpose; they are quite too tame. The latitude in which they originated was too cold. Other conventions, of more recent existence, have gone a

whole bar's length beyond it. The learned doctors of Colleton and Abbeville<sup>1</sup> have pushed their commentaries on the Hartford collect so far that the original text-writers are thrown entirely into the shade. I have nothing to do, sir, with the Hartford Convention. Its journal, which the gentleman has quoted, I never read. So far as the honorable member may discover in its proceedings a spirit in any degree resembling that which was avowed and justified in those other conventions to which I have alluded, or so far as those proceedings can be shown to be disloyal to the Constitution, or tending to disunion, so far I shall be as ready as any one to bestow on them reprehension and censure.

Having dwelt long on this convention, and other occurrences of that day, in the hope, probably (which will not be gratified), that I should leave the course of this debate to follow him at length in those excursions, the honorable member returned, and attempted another object. He referred to a speech of mine in the other house, the same which I had occasion to allude to myself the other day; and has quoted a passage or two from it, with a bold though uneasy and laboring air of confidence, as if he had detected in me an inconsistency. Judging from the gentleman's manner, a stranger to the course of the debate and to the point in discussion would have imagined, from so triumphant a tone, that the honorable member was

<sup>1</sup> Hayne was born in Colleton District, and Calhoun in Abbeville District, South Carolina. The allusion, however, is probably to the anti-tariff meetings in South Carolina, particularly one at Walterborough, the capital of Colleton District, on June 12, 1828, and one at Abbeville Court House, the capital of Abbeville District, on September 25, 1828.

about to overwhelm me with a manifest contradiction. Any one who heard him, and who had not heard what I had in fact previously said, must have thought me routed and discomfited, as the gentleman had promised. Sir, a breath blows all this triumph away. There is not the slightest difference in the purport of my remarks on the two occasions. What I said here on Wednesday is in exact accordance with the opinion expressed by me in the other house in 1825. Though the gentleman had the metaphysics of *Hudibras*, though he were able

“to sever and divide

A hair 'twixt north and northwest side,”<sup>1</sup>

he yet could not insert his metaphysical scissors between the fair reading of my remarks in 1825 and what I said here last week. There is not only no contradiction, no difference, but, in truth, too exact a similarity, both in thought and language, to be entirely in just taste. I had myself quoted the same speech; had recurred to it, and spoke with it open before me; and much of what I said was little more than a repetition from it. In order to make finishing work with this alleged contradiction, permit me to recur to the origin of this debate, and review its course. This seems expedient, and may be done as well now as at any time.

Well, then, its history is this: The honorable member from Connecticut moved a resolution which constitutes the first branch of that which is now before us; that is to say, a resolution instructing the committee on public lands to inquire into the expediency

<sup>1</sup> “He could distinguish and divide

A hair 'twixt south and southwest side.”

BUTLER'S *Hudibras*, pt. i. canto 1, lines 67, 68.

of limiting for a certain period the sales of the public lands to such as have heretofore been offered for sale; and whether sundry offices connected with the sales of the lands might not be abolished without detriment to the public service. In the progress of the discussion which arose on this resolution, an honorable member from New Hampshire<sup>1</sup> moved to amend the resolution so as entirely to reverse its object; that is, to strike it all out, and insert a direction to the committee to inquire into the expediency of adopting measures to hasten the sales, and extend more rapidly the surveys of the lands.

The honorable member from Maine<sup>2</sup> suggested that both those propositions might well enough go for consideration to the committee; and in this state of the question the member from South Carolina addressed the Senate in his first speech. He rose, he said, to give us his own free thoughts on the public lands. I saw him rise with pleasure, and listened with expectation, though before he concluded I was filled with surprise. Certainly I was never more surprised than to find him following up, to the extent he did, the sentiments and opinions which the gentleman from Missouri had put forth, and which it is known he has long entertained.

I need not repeat at large the general topics of the honorable gentleman's speech. When he said yesterday that he did not attack the Eastern States, he certainly must have forgotten, not only particular remarks, but the whole drift and tenor of his speech; unless he means, by not attacking, that he did not commence hostilities, but that another had preceded him in the attack. He in the first place disapproved

<sup>1</sup> Levi Woodbury.

<sup>2</sup> Peleg Sprague.

of the whole course of the government for forty years in regard to its disposition of the public lands; and then, turning northward and eastward, and fancying he had found a cause for alleged narrowness and niggardliness in the "accursed policy" of the tariff, to which he represented the people of New England as wedded, he went on for a full hour with remarks the whole scope of which was to exhibit the results of this policy in feelings and in measures unfavorable to the West. I thought his opinions unfounded and erroneous as to the general course of the government, and ventured to reply to them.

The gentleman had remarked on the analogy of other cases, and quoted the conduct of European governments towards their own subjects settling on this continent as in point, to show that we had been harsh and rigid in selling, when we should have given the public lands to settlers without price. I thought the honorable member had suffered his judgment to be betrayed by a false analogy; that he was struck with an appearance of resemblance where there was no real similitude. I think so still. The first settlers of North America were enterprising spirits, engaged in private adventure, or fleeing from tyranny at home. When arrived here, they were forgotten by the mother country, or remembered only to be oppressed. Carried away again by the appearance of analogy, or struck with the eloquence of the passage, the honorable member yesterday observed that the conduct of government toward the Western emigrants, or my representation of it, brought to his mind a celebrated speech in the British Parliament. It was, sir, the speech of Colonel Barré. On the question of the

Stamp Act,<sup>1</sup> or tea tax, I forget which, Colonel Barré had heard a member on the Treasury bench argue that the people of the United States, being British colonists, planted by the maternal care, nourished by the indulgence and protected by the arms of England, would not grudge their mite to relieve the mother country from the heavy burden under which she groaned. The language of Colonel Barré in reply to this was: "They planted by your care? Your oppression planted them in America. They fled from your tyranny, and grew by your neglect of them. So soon as you began to care for them, you showed your care by sending persons to spy out their liberties, misrepresent their character, prey upon them, and eat out their substance."

And how does the honorable gentleman mean to maintain that language like this is applicable to the conduct of the government of the United States toward the Western emigrants, or to any representation given by me of that conduct? Were the settlers in the West driven thither by our oppression? Have they flourished only by our neglect of them? Has the government done nothing but prey upon them and eat out their substance? Sir, this fervid eloquence of the British speaker, just when and where it was uttered, and fit to remain an exercise for the schools, is not a little out of place when it is brought thence to be applied here to the conduct of our own

<sup>1</sup> This was the speech of Colonel Isaac Barré in reply to Grenville during the passage of the Stamp Act (*Parliamentary History of England*, xvi. 38). In this speech occurred the expression "sons of liberty," which was speedily adopted by the famous society of that name. Barré was in speech as potent for invective as was Junius with his pen. See also Hayne's Speech (pp. 27 n., 28 n.).

country toward her own citizens. From America to England, it may be true; from Americans to their own government, it would be strange language. Let us leave it to be recited and declaimed by our boys against a foreign nation; not introduce it here, to recite and declaim ourselves against our own.

But I come to the point of the alleged contradiction. In my remarks on Wednesday I contended that we could not give away gratuitously all the public lands; that we held them in trust; that the government had solemnly pledged itself to dispose of them as a common fund for the common benefit, and to sell and settle them as its discretion should dictate. Now, sir, what contradiction does the gentleman find to this sentiment in the speech of 1825? He quotes me as having then said that we ought not to hug these lands as a very great treasure. Very well, sir, supposing me to be accurately reported in that expression, what is the contradiction? I have not now said that we should hug these lands as a favorite source of pecuniary income. No such thing. It is not my view. What I have said, and what I do say, is, that they are a common fund, to be disposed of for the common benefit, to be sold at low prices for the accommodation of settlers, keeping the object of settling the lands as much in view as that of raising money from them. This I say now, and this I have always said. Is this hugging them as a favorite treasure? Is there no difference between hugging and hoarding this fund, on the one hand, as a great treasure, and on the other of disposing of it at low prices, placing the proceeds in the general treasury of the Union? My opinion is that as much is to be made of the land as fairly and reasonably may be, selling it all the while at such

rates as to give the fullest effect to settlement.<sup>1</sup> This is not giving it all away to the States, as the gentleman would propose; nor is it hugging the fund closely and tenaciously, as a favorite treasure; but it is, in my judgment, a just and wise policy, perfectly according with all the various duties which rest on government. So much for my contradiction. And what is it? Where is the ground of the gentleman's triumph? What inconsistency in word or doctrine has he been able to detect? Sir, if this be a sample of that discomfiture with which the honorable gentleman threatened me, commend me to the word "discomfiture" for the rest of my life.

But, after all, this is not the point of the debate, and I must now bring the gentleman back to that which is the point.

The real question between me and him is, Has the doctrine been advanced at the South or at the East that the population of the West should be retarded, or at least need not be hastened, on account of its effect to drain off the people from the Atlantic States? Is this doctrine, as has been alleged, of Eastern origin? That is the question. Has the gentleman found anything by which he can make good his accusation? I submit to the Senate that he has entirely failed; and, as far as this debate has shown, the only person who has advanced such sentiments is a gentleman from South Carolina, and a friend to the honorable member

<sup>1</sup> The whole subject of the public lands is admirably covered by Worthington C. Ford in Lalor's *Cyclopædia of Political Science*, iii. 460 *et seq.* See, as well, Benton's *Abridgment of Debates*, the Reports of the General Land Office and of the Public Land Commission; and particularly the latter's comprehensive work, *The Public Domain*, prepared by Thomas Donaldson (1884), and *American State Papers* (volumes relating to public lands).

himself. The honorable gentleman has given no answer to this; there is none which can be given. This simple fact, while it requires no comment to enforce it, defies all argument to refute it. I could refer to the speeches of another Southern gentleman<sup>1</sup> in years before, of the same general character and to the same effect as that which has been quoted; but I will not consume the time of the Senate by the reading of them.

So, then, sir, New England is guiltless of the policy of retarding Western population, and of all envy and jealousy of the growth of the new States. Whatever there be of that policy in the country, no part of it is hers. If it has a local habitation, the honorable member has probably seen by this time where to look for it; and if it now has received a name, he has himself christened it.

We approach at length, sir, to a more important part of the honorable gentleman's observations. Since it does not accord with my views of justice and policy to give away the public lands altogether, as a mere matter of gratuity, I am asked by the honorable gentleman on what ground it is that I consent to vote them away in particular instances. How, he inquires, do I reconcile with these professed sentiments my support of measures appropriating portions of the lands to particular roads, particular canals, particular rivers, and particular institutions of education in the West? This leads, sir, to the real and wide difference in political opinion between the honorable

<sup>1</sup> Probably a reference to George McDuffie, afterward governor of South Carolina and eulogist of Mr. Hayne. In 1825 he made a speech from which Webster quotes in his first speech (of January 20).

gentleman and myself. On my part, I look upon all these objects as connected with the common good, fairly embraced in its object and its terms; he, on the contrary, deems them all, if good at all, only local good. This is our difference. The interrogatory, which he proceeded to put, at once explains this difference. "What interest," asks he, "has South Carolina in a canal in Ohio?" Sir, this very question is full of significance. It develops the gentleman's whole political system, and its answer expounds mine. Here we differ. I look upon a road over the Alleghanies, a canal round the falls of the Ohio, or a canal or railway from the Atlantic to the western waters, as being an object large and extensive enough to be fairly said to be for the common benefit. The gentleman thinks otherwise, and this is the key to his construction of the powers of the government. He may well ask what interest has South Carolina in a canal in Ohio. On his system, it is true, she has no interest. On that system, Ohio and Carolina are different governments and different countries, connected here, it is true, by some slight and ill-defined bond of union, but in all main respects separate and diverse. On that system, Carolina has no more interest in a canal in Ohio than in Mexico. The gentleman, therefore, only follows out his own principles; he does no more than arrive at the natural conclusions of his own doctrines; he only announces the true results of that creed which he has adopted himself, and would persuade others to adopt, when he thus declares that South Carolina has no interest in a public work in Ohio.

Sir, we narrow-minded people of New England do not reason thus. Our *notion* of things is entirely

different. We look upon the States, not as separated, but as united. We love to dwell on that union, and on the mutual happiness which it has so much promoted, and the common renown which it has so greatly contributed to acquire. In our contemplation, Carolina and Ohio are parts of the same country; States united under the same general government, having interests common, associated, intermingled. In whatever is within the proper sphere of the constitutional power of this government, we look upon the States as one. We do not impose geographical limits to our patriotic feeling or regard; we do not follow rivers and mountains and lines of latitude to find boundaries beyond which public improvements do not benefit us. We, who come here as agents and representatives of these narrow-minded and selfish men of New England, consider ourselves as bound to regard with an equal eye the good of the whole, in whatever is within our power of legislation. Sir, if a railroad or canal, beginning in South Carolina and ending in South Carolina, appeared to me to be of national importance and national magnitude, believing, as I do, that the power of government extends to the encouragement of works of that description, if I were to stand up here and ask, What interest has Massachusetts in a railroad in South Carolina? I should not be willing to face my constituents. These same narrow-minded men would tell me that they had sent me to act for the whole country, and that one who possessed too little comprehension, either of intellect or feeling, one who was not large enough, both in mind and in heart, to embrace the whole, was not fit to be intrusted with the interest of any part.

Sir, I do not desire to enlarge the powers of the

government by unjustifiable construction, nor to exercise any not within a fair interpretation. But when it is believed that a power does exist, then it is, in my judgment, to be exercised for the general benefit of the whole. So far as respects the exercise of such a power, the States are one. It was the very object of the Constitution to create unity of interests to the extent of the powers of the general government. In war and peace we are one; in commerce one; because the authority of the general government reaches to war and peace, and to the regulation of commerce. I have never seen any more difficulty in erecting lighthouses on the lakes than on the ocean; in improving the harbors of inland seas than if they were within the ebb and flow of the tide; or in removing obstructions in the vast streams of the West, more than in any work to facilitate commerce on the Atlantic coast. If there be any power for one, there is power also for the other; and they are all and equally for the common good of the country.

There are other objects apparently more local, or the benefit of which is less general, towards which, nevertheless, I have concurred with others to give aid by donations of land. It is proposed to construct a road in or through one of the new States in which this government possesses large quantities of land. Have the United States no right, or, as a great and untaxed proprietor, are they under no obligation to contribute to an object thus calculated to promote the common good of all the proprietors, themselves included? And even with respect to education, which is the extreme case, let the question be considered. In the first place, as we have seen, it was made matter of compact with these States that they should do

their part to promote education. In the next place, our whole system of land laws proceeds on the idea that education is for the common good;<sup>1</sup> because, in every division, a certain portion is uniformly reserved and appropriated for the use of schools. And, finally, have not these new States singularly strong claims, founded on the ground already stated, that the government is a great untaxed proprietor in the ownership of the soil? It is a consideration of great importance that probably there is in no part of the country or of the world so great a call for the means of education as in those new States, owing to the vast number of persons within those ages in which education and instruction are usually received, if received at all. This is the natural consequence of recency of settlement and rapid increase. The census of these States shows how great a proportion of the whole population occupies the classes between infancy and manhood. These are the wide fields, and here is the deep and quick soil for the seeds of knowledge and virtue; and this is the favored season, the springtime for sowing them. Let them be disseminated without stint. Let them be scattered with a bountiful hand broadcast. Whatever the government can fairly do towards these objects, in my opinion, ought to be done.

These, sir, are the grounds, succinctly stated, on which my votes for grants of lands for particular objects rest; while I maintain at the same time that it is all a common fund, for the common benefit. And reasons like these, I presume, have influenced the votes of other gentlemen from New England. Those

<sup>1</sup> See G. W. Knight's "History and Management of Land granted for Education" (*American Historical Association Papers*, vol. i. no. 3, 1884), which contains a full list of books on this topic.

who have a different view of the powers of the government, of course, come to different conclusions on these as on other questions. I observed, when speaking on this subject before, that if we looked to any measure, whether for a road, a canal, or anything else intended for the improvement of the West, it would be found that, if the New England *ayes* were struck out of the list of votes, the Southern *noes* would always have rejected the measure. The truth of this has not been denied and cannot be denied. In stating this I thought it just to ascribe it to the constitutional scruples of the South, rather than to any other less favorable or less charitable cause. But no sooner had I done this than the honorable gentleman asks if I reproach him and his friends with their constitutional scruples? Sir, I reproach nobody. I stated a fact, and gave the most respectful reason for it that occurred to me. The gentleman cannot deny the fact; he may, if he choose, disclaim the reason. It is not long since I had occasion, in presenting a petition from his own State,<sup>1</sup> to account for its being intrusted to my hands, by saying that the constitutional opinions of the gentleman and his worthy colleague prevented them from supporting it. Sir, did I state this as a matter of reproach? Far from it. Did I attempt to find any other cause than an honest one for these scruples? Sir, I did not. It did not become me to doubt or to insinuate that the gentleman had either changed his sentiments, or that he had made up a set of constitutional opinions accommodated to

<sup>1</sup> From the South Carolina Canal and Railroad Company, presented January 18, 1830, and asking Congress to authorize a subscription on the part of government of 25,000 shares of the capital stock.

any particular combination of political occurrences. Had I done so, I should have felt that, while I was entitled to little credit in thus questioning other people's motives, I justified the whole world in suspecting my own. But how has the gentleman returned this respect for others' opinions? His own candor and justice, — how have they been exhibited towards the motives of others while he has been at so much pains to maintain what nobody has disputed, — the purity of his own? Why, sir, he has asked *when*, and *how*, and *why* New England votes were found going for measures favorable to the West; he has demanded to be informed whether all this did not begin in 1825, and while the election of President was still pending.

Sir, to these questions retort would be justified; and it is both cogent and at hand. Nevertheless, I will answer the inquiry, not by retort, but by facts. I will tell the gentleman *when*, and *how*, and *why* New England has supported measures favorable to the West. I have already referred to the early history of the government, to the first acquisition of the lands, to the original laws for disposing of them, and for governing the territories where they lie; and have shown the influence of New England men and New England principles in all these leading measures. I should not be pardoned were I to go over that ground again. Coming to more recent times, and to measures of a less general character, I have endeavored to prove that everything of this kind, designed for Western improvement, has depended on the votes of New England; all this is true beyond the power of contradiction. And now, sir, there are two measures to which I will refer, not so ancient as to belong to the early history of the public lands, and not so recent

as to be on this side of the period when the gentleman charitably imagines a new direction may have been given to New England feeling and New England votes. These measures, and the New England votes in support of them, may be taken as samples and specimens of all the rest.

In 1820 (observe, Mr. President, in 1820), the people of the West besought Congress for a reduction in the price of lands. In favor of that reduction, New England, with a delegation of forty members in the other house, gave thirty-three votes, and one only against it. The four Southern States, with more than fifty members, gave thirty-two votes for it and seven against it. Again, in 1821 (observe again, sir, the time), the law passed for the relief of the purchasers of the public lands. This was a measure of vital importance to the West, and more especially to the Southwest. It authorized the relinquishment of contracts for lands which had been entered into at high prices, and a reduction in other cases of not less than thirty-seven and a half per cent. on the purchase-money. Many millions of dollars — six or seven, I believe, probably much more — were relinquished by this law. On this bill, New England, with her forty members, gave more affirmative votes than the four Southern States, with their fifty-two or fifty-three members. These two are far the most important general measures respecting the public lands which have been adopted within the last twenty years. They took place in 1820 and 1821. That is the time *when*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In 1821 memorials were presented for the relief of settlers. At a minimum, set in 1800, of two dollars an acre, of which the whole sum was to be paid within four years, there was to be a forfeiture of all payments in case of delinquency. Owing to

As to the manner *how*, the gentleman already sees that it was by voting in solid column for the required relief. And, lastly, as to the cause *why*, I tell the gentleman it was because the members from New England thought the measures just and salutary; because they entertained towards the West neither envy, hatred, nor malice; because they deemed it becoming them, as just and enlightened men, to meet the exigency which had arisen in the West with the appropriate measure of relief; because they felt it due to their own characters, and the characters of their New England predecessors in this government, to act towards the new States in the spirit of a liberal, patronizing, magnanimous policy. So much, sir, for the cause *why*; and I hope that by this time, sir, the honorable gentleman is satisfied; if not, I do not know *when*, or *how*, or *why* he ever will be.

Having recurred to these two important measures in answer to the gentleman's inquiries, I must now beg permission to go back to a period somewhat earlier, for the purpose of still further showing how much, or rather how little, reason there is for the gentleman's insinuation that political hopes or fears, or party associations, were the grounds of these New England votes. And after what has been said, I hope it may be forgiven me if I allude to some political opinions and votes of my own, of very little public importance certainly, but which, from the time at which they were speculations, in which small payments only had been made, depression and then failures ensued. More than twenty-three millions of dollars were owed the government. On this debt extensions had been made, and in 1820 the minimum price was reduced to \$1.25 an acre, and the credit changed to a cash system. Settlers were encouraged to buy of government at this reduced price.

given and expressed, may pass for good witnesses on this occasion.

This government, Mr. President, from its origin to the peace of 1815, had been too much engrossed with various other important concerns to be able to turn its thoughts inward, and look to the development of its vast internal resources. In the early part of President Washington's administration, it was fully occupied with completing its own organization, providing for the public debt, defending the frontiers, and maintaining domestic peace. Before the termination of that administration, the fires of the French Revolution blazed forth, as from a new-opened volcano, and the whole breadth of the ocean did not secure us from its effects. The smoke and the cinders reached us, though not the burning lava. Difficult and agitating questions, embarrassing to government and dividing public opinion, sprung out of the new state of our foreign relations, and were succeeded by others, and yet again by others, equally embarrassing and equally exciting division and discord, through the long series of twenty years, till they finally issued in the war with England. Down to the close of that war, no distinct, marked, and deliberate attention had been given, or could have been given, to the internal condition of the country, its capacities of improvement, or the constitutional power of the government in regard to objects connected with such improvement.

The peace, Mr. President, brought about an entirely new and a most interesting state of things; it opened to us other prospects and suggested other duties. We ourselves were changed, and the whole world was changed. The pacification of Europe, after June, 1815, assumed a firm and permanent aspect. The

nations evidently manifested that they were disposed for peace. Some agitation of the waves might be expected even after the storm had subsided, but the tendency was, strongly and rapidly, toward settled repose.

It so happened, sir, that I was at that time a member of Congress, and, like others, naturally turned my thoughts to the contemplation of the recently altered condition of the country and of the world. It appeared plainly enough to me, as well as to wiser and more experienced men, that the policy of the government would naturally take a start in a new direction; because new directions would necessarily be given to the pursuits and occupations of the people. We had pushed our commerce far and fast, under the advantage of a neutral flag. But there were now no longer flags, either neutral or belligerent. The harvest of neutrality had been great, but we had gathered it all. With the peace of Europe, it was obvious there would spring up in her circle of nations a revived and invigorated spirit of trade, and a new activity in all the business and objects of civilized life. Hereafter, our commercial gains were to be earned only by success in a close and intense competition. Other nations would produce for themselves, and carry for themselves, and manufacture for themselves, to the full extent of their abilities. The crops of our plains would no longer sustain European armies, nor our ships longer supply those whom war had rendered unable to supply themselves. It was obvious that, under these circumstances, the country would begin to survey itself, and to estimate its own capacity of improvement.

And this improvement, — how was it to be accomplished, and who was to accomplish it? We were ten

or twelve millions of people, spread over almost half a world. We were more than twenty States, some stretching along the same seaboard, some along the same line of inland frontier, and others on opposite banks of the same vast rivers. Two considerations at once presented themselves with great force in looking at this state of things. One was, that that great branch of improvement which consisted in furnishing new facilities of intercourse necessarily ran into different States in every leading instance, and would benefit the citizens of all such States. No one State, therefore, in such cases, would assume the whole expense, nor was the coöperation of several States to be expected. Take the instance of the Delaware breakwater.<sup>1</sup> It will cost several millions of money. Would Pennsylvania alone ever have constructed it? Certainly never, while this Union lasts, because it is not for her sole benefit. Would Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware have united to accomplish it at their joint expense? Certainly not, for the same reason. It could not be done, therefore, but by the general government. The same may be said of the large inland undertakings, except that, in them, government, instead of bearing the whole expense, coöperates with others who bear a part. The other consideration is that the United States have the means. They enjoy the revenues derived from commerce, and the States have no abundant and easy sources of public income. The custom-houses fill the general treasury, while the

<sup>1</sup> In the first report on plans for a harbor near the mouth of Delaware Bay, made on February 2, 1829, by a commission appointed by Congress, Cape Henlopen was selected as the site of a breakwater. Work was begun in 1829, under the direction of William Strickland. On November 4, 1869, the work was finished according to the original project.

States have scanty resources, except by resort to heavy direct taxes.

Under this view of things, I thought it necessary to settle, at least for myself, some definite notions with respect to the powers of the government in regard to internal affairs. It may not savor too much of self-commendation to remark that, with this object, I considered the Constitution, its judicial construction, its contemporaneous exposition, and the whole history of the legislation of Congress under it; and I arrived at the conclusion that government had power to accomplish sundry objects, or aid in their accomplishment, which are now commonly spoken of as INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS. That conclusion, sir, may have been right, or it may have been wrong. I am not about to argue the grounds of it at large. I say only that it was adopted and acted on even so early as in 1816. Yes, Mr. President, I made up my opinion, and determined on my intended course of political conduct, on these subjects, in the Fourteenth Congress, in 1816. And now, Mr. President, I have further to say that I made up these opinions, and entered on this course of political conduct, *Teucro duce*.<sup>1</sup> Yes, sir, I pursued

<sup>1</sup> "Nil desperandum Teucro duce et auspice Teucro" (nothing is to be despaired of under the leadership and auspices of Teucer) is from Horace's Odes, book i. carmen vii. line 27. Gales's transcript from the shorthand report reads as follows: "I made up my mind on that subject, *te duce*." Mrs. Jared Sparks, daughter of Senator Silsbee, Mr. Webster's colleague, in a communication to the *Boston Transcript* of June 5, 1882, says that Mr. Calhoun challenged the expression *te duce*, and that Mr. Webster denied any intentional allusion to the chair, and affirmed that his expression was *Teucro duce*. To whom he did allude is uncertain. Teucer, a famous archer, was the son of Telamon and step-brother of Ajax. Regarding Mr. Calhoun's interruption see the note on p. 159.

in all this a South Carolina track on the doctrines of internal improvement. South Carolina, as she was then represented in the other house, set forth in 1816 under a fresh and leading breeze, and I was among the followers. But if my leader sees new lights and turns a sharp corner, unless I see new lights also, I keep straight on in the same path. I repeat that leading gentlemen from South Carolina were first and foremost in behalf of the doctrines of internal improvements, when those doctrines came first to be considered and acted upon in Congress. The debate on the bank question, on the tariff of 1816, and on the direct tax will show who was who, and what was what, at that time.

The tariff of 1816 (one of the plain cases of oppression and usurpation, from which, if the government does not recede, individual States may justly secede from the government) is, sir, in truth, a South Carolina tariff, supported by South Carolina votes. But for those votes it could not have passed in the form in which it did pass; whereas, if it had depended on Massachusetts votes, it would have been lost. Does not the honorable gentleman well know all this? There are certainly those who do, full well, know it all. I do not say this to reproach South Carolina. I only state the fact; and I think it will appear to be true that, among the earliest and boldest advocates of the tariff, as a measure of protection, and on the express ground of protection, were leading gentlemen of South Carolina in Congress. I did not then, and cannot now, understand their language in any other sense. While this tariff of 1816 was under discussion in the House of Representatives, an honorable gentleman from Georgia,<sup>1</sup> now of this house, moved to

<sup>1</sup> John Forsyth.

reduce the proposed duty on cotton. He failed by four votes, South Carolina giving three votes (enough to have turned the scale) against his motion. The act, sir, then passed, and received on its passage the support of a majority of the Representatives of South Carolina present and voting. This act is the first in the order of those now denounced as plain usurpations. We see it daily in the list, by the side of those of 1824 and 1828, as a case of manifest oppression, justifying disunion. I put it home to the honorable member from South Carolina, that his own State was not only "art and part" in this measure, but the *causa causans*.<sup>1</sup> Without her aid, this seminal principle of mischief, this root of Upas, could not have been planted. I have already said, and it is true, that this act proceeded on the ground of protection. It interfered directly with existing interests of great value and amount. It cut up the Calcutta cotton trade by the roots, but it passed nevertheless, and it passed on the principle of protecting manufactures, on the principle against free trade, on the principle opposed to that *which lets us alone*.<sup>2</sup>

Such, Mr. President, were the opinions of important and leading gentlemen from South Carolina on the subject of internal improvement in 1816. I went out of Congress the next year, and, returning again in 1823, thought I found South Carolina where I had left her. I really supposed that all things remained as they were, and that the South Carolina doctrine

<sup>1</sup> The real effective cause. (Stroud's *Judicial Dictionary*.) And so the cause of the thing causing is the cause of the effect. See Massachusetts Reports, 4 Gray, 398.

<sup>2</sup> This allusion to the *laissez-faire* theory could not have been so obvious then as now.

of internal improvements would be defended by the same eloquent voices, and the same strong arms, as formerly. In the lapse of these six years, it is true, political associations had assumed a new aspect and new divisions. A strong party had arisen in the South hostile to the doctrine of internal improvements. Anti-consolidation was the flag under which this party fought; and its supporters inveighed against internal improvements, much after the manner in which the honorable gentleman has now inveighed against them, as part and parcel of the system of consolidation. Whether this party arose in South Carolina itself, or in the neighborhood, is more than I know. I think the latter. However that may have been, there were those found in South Carolina ready to make war upon it, and who did make intrepid war upon it. Names being regarded as things in such controversies, they bestowed on the anti-improvement gentlemen the appellation of Radicals. Yes, sir, the appellation of Radicals, as a term of distinction applicable and applied to those who denied the liberal doctrines of internal improvement, originated, according to the best of my recollection, somewhere between North Carolina and Georgia. Well, sir, these mischievous Radicals were to be put down, and the strong arm of South Carolina was stretched out to put them down. About this time I returned to Congress. The battle with the Radicals had been fought, and our South Carolina champions of the doctrines of internal improvement had nobly maintained their ground, and were understood to have achieved a victory. We looked upon them as conquerors. They had driven back the enemy with discomfiture, — a thing, by the way, sir, which is not always performed when it is promised.

A gentleman to whom I have already referred in this debate had come into Congress, during my absence from it, from South Carolina, and had brought with him a high reputation for ability. He came from a school with which we had been acquainted, *et noscitur a sociis*.<sup>1</sup> I hold in my hand, sir, a printed speech of this distinguished gentleman<sup>2</sup> on "Internal Improvements," delivered about the period to which I now refer, and printed with a few introductory remarks upon consolidation, in which, sir, I think he quite consolidated the arguments of his opponents, the Radicals, if to crush be to consolidate. I give you a short but significant quotation from these remarks. He is speaking of a pamphlet then recently published, entitled "Consolidation;" and, having alluded to the question of renewing the charter of the former Bank of the United States, he says: "Moreover, in the early history of parties, and when Mr. Crawford advocated a renewal of the old charter, it was considered a Federal measure; which internal improvements *never was*, as this author erroneously states. This latter measure originated, in the administration of Mr. Jefferson, with the appropriation for the Cumberland Road, and was first proposed, as a system, by Mr. Calhoun, and carried through the House of Representatives by a large majority of the Republicans, including almost every one of the leading men who carried us through the late war."

So, then, internal improvement<sup>3</sup> is not one of the Federal heresies. One paragraph more, sir:—

<sup>1</sup> Colloquially, "And he is known by the company he keeps."

<sup>2</sup> Mr. McDuffie. See page 139.

<sup>3</sup> The policy of internal improvements, the espousal of which contributed largely to the overturn of the administration of the

“The author in question, not content with denouncing as Federalists General Jackson, Mr. Adams, Mr. Calhoun, and the majority of the South Carolina delegation in Congress, modestly extends the denunciation to Mr. Monroe and the whole Republican party. Here are his words: ‘During the administration of Mr. Monroe, much had passed which the Republican party would be glad to approve if they could!! But the principal feature, and that which has chiefly elicited these observations, is the renewal of the SYSTEM OF INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS.’ Now this measure was adopted by a vote of 115 to 86 of a Republican Congress, and sanctioned by a Republican President. Who, then, is this author who assumes the high prerogative of denouncing, in the name of the Republican party, the Republican administration of the country? A denunciation including within its sweep Calhoun, Lowndes, and Cheves, — men who will be regarded as the brightest ornaments of South Carolina, and the strongest pillars of the Republican party, as long as the late war shall be remembered, and talents and patriotism shall be regarded as the proper objects of the admiration and gratitude of a free people!!”

Such are the opinions, sir, which were maintained by South Carolina gentlemen in the House of Representatives, on the subject of internal improvements, when I took my seat there as a member from Massachusetts in 1823. But this is not all. We had a bill before us, and passed it in that House, entitled “An act to procure the necessary surveys, plans, and estimates upon the subject of roads and canals.” It authorized the President to cause surveys and esti-

second Adams, is concisely treated by Alexander Johnston in an article in Lalor’s *Cyclopædia of Political Science*, ii. 568.

mates to be made of the routes of such roads and canals as he might deem of national importance in a commercial or military point of view, or for the transportation of the mail, and appropriated thirty thousand dollars out of the treasury to defray the expense. This act, though preliminary in its nature, covered the whole ground. It took for granted the complete power of internal improvement, as far as any of its advocates had ever contended for it. Having passed the other house, the bill came up to the Senate, and was here considered and debated in April, 1824. The honorable member from South Carolina was a member of the Senate at that time. While the bill was under consideration here, a motion was made to add the following proviso: "*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to affirm *or admit* a power in Congress, on their own authority, to make roads or canals within any of the States of the Union." The yeas and nays were taken on this proviso, and the honorable member voted in the negative! The proviso failed.

A motion was then made to add this proviso, viz.: "*Provided*, That the faith of the United States is hereby pledged that no money shall ever be expended for roads or canals, except it shall be among the several States, and in the same proportion as direct taxes are laid and assessed by the provisions of the Constitution." The honorable member voted against this proviso also, and it failed. The bill was then put on its passage, and the honorable member voted for it, and it passed and became a law.

Now, it strikes me, sir, that there is no maintaining these votes but upon the power of internal improvement, in its broadest sense. In truth, these bills for

surveys and estimates have always been considered as test questions; they show who is for and who against internal improvement. This law itself went the whole length, and assumed the full and complete power. The gentleman's votes sustained that power in every form in which the various propositions to amend presented it. He went for the entire and unrestrained authority, without consulting the States, and without agreeing to any proportionate distribution. And now suffer me to remind you, Mr. President, that it is this very same power, thus sanctioned in every form by the gentleman's own opinion, which is so plain and manifest a usurpation that the State of South Carolina is supposed to be justified in refusing submission to any laws carrying the power into effect. Truly, sir, is not this a little too hard? May we not crave some mercy, under favor and protection of the gentleman's own authority? Admitting that a road or a canal must be written down flat usurpation as was ever committed, may we find no mitigation in our respect for his place, and his vote, as one that knows the law?

The tariff, which South Carolina had an efficient hand in establishing in 1816, and this asserted power of internal improvement advanced by her in the same year, and, as we have seen, approved and sanctioned by her representatives in 1824, — these two measures are the great grounds on which she is now thought to be justified in breaking up the Union, if she sees fit to break it up!

I may now safely say, I think, that we have had the authority of leading and distinguished gentlemen from South Carolina in support of the doctrine of internal improvement. I repeat that, up to 1824, I,

for one, followed South Carolina; but when that star in its ascension veered off in an unexpected direction, I relied on its light no longer. [Here the Vice-President said: "Does the chair understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that the person now occupying the chair of the Senate has changed his opinions on the subject of internal improvements?"]<sup>1</sup> From nothing ever said to me, sir, have I had reason to know of any change in the opinions of the person filling the chair of the Senate. If such change has taken place, I regret it. I speak generally of the State of South Carolina. Individuals we know there are who hold opinions favorable to the power. An application for its exercise in behalf of a public work in South Carolina itself is now pending, I believe, in the other house, presented by members from that State.

I have thus, sir, perhaps not without some tediousness of detail, shown, if I am in error on the subjects of internal improvement, how and in what company I fell into that error. If I am wrong, it is apparent who misled me.

I go to other remarks of the honorable member; and I have to complain of an entire misapprehension of what I said on the subject of the national debt, though I can hardly perceive how any one could mis-

<sup>1</sup> This interruption on the part of Mr. Calhoun was unparliamentary. The Vice-President's functions are to enforce rules and preserve order, and to vote in case of a tie, but he may not join in debate. Senator Forsyth, who was interrupted by the chair on January 25, 1832, when the confirmation of Van Buren as minister to England was under consideration, rebuked Mr. Calhoun. Since that occurrence, there has been no interference with the discussions of the Senate on the part of the presiding officer. See also note on page 151.

understand me. What I said was, not that I wished to put off the payment of the debt, but, on the contrary, that I had always voted for every measure for its reduction as uniformly as the gentleman himself. He seems to claim the exclusive merit of a disposition to reduce the public charge. I do not allow it to him. As a debt, I was — I am for paying it, because it is a charge on our finances, and on the industry of the country. But I observed that I thought I perceived a morbid fervor on that subject, an excessive anxiety to pay off the debt, not so much because it is a debt simply, as because, while it lasts, it furnishes one objection to disunion. It is, while it continues, a tie of common interest. I did not impute such motives to the honorable member himself, but that there is such a feeling in existence I have not a particle of doubt. The most I said was that, if one effect of the debt was to strengthen our Union, that effect itself was not regretted by me, however much others might regret it. The gentleman has not seen how to reply to this otherwise than by supposing me to have advanced the doctrine that a national debt is a national blessing. Others, I must hope, will find much less difficulty in understanding me. I distinctly and pointedly cautioned the honorable member not to understand me as expressing an opinion favorable to the continuance of the debt. I repeated this caution, and repeated it more than once; but it was thrown away.

On yet another point I was still more unaccountably misunderstood. The gentleman had harangued against “consolidation.” I told him, in reply, that there was one kind of consolidation to which I was attached, and that was the consolidation of our Union;

that this was precisely that consolidation to which I feared others were not attached, and that such consolidation was the very end of the Constitution, the leading object, as they had informed us themselves, which its framers had kept in view. I turned to their communication<sup>1</sup> and read their very words, "the consolidation of the Union," and expressed my devotion to this sort of consolidation. I said, in terms, that I wished not in the slightest degree to augment the powers of this government; that my object was to preserve, not to enlarge; and that by consolidating the Union I understood no more than the strengthening of the Union and perpetuating it. Having been thus explicit, having thus read from the printed book the precise words which I adopted as expressing my own sentiments, it passes comprehension how any man could understand me as contending for an extension of the powers of the government, or for consolidation in that odious sense in which it means an accumulation in the federal government of the powers properly belonging to the States.

I repeat, sir, that, in adopting the sentiment of the framers of the Constitution, I read their language audibly and word for word; and I pointed out the distinction, just as fully as I have now done, between the consolidation of the Union and that other obnoxious consolidation which I disclaimed. And yet the honorable member misunderstood me. The gentleman had said that he wished for no fixed revenue, — not a shilling. If by a word he could convert the Capitol into gold, he would not do it. Why all this fear of revenue? Why, sir, because, as the gentle-

<sup>1</sup> The letter of the Federal Convention to the Congress of the Confederation, transmitting the plan of the Constitution.

man told us, it tends to consolidation. Now this can mean neither more nor less than that a common revenue is a common interest, and that all common interests tend to preserve the union of the States. I confess I like that tendency; if the gentleman dislikes it, he is right in deprecating a shilling of fixed revenue. So much, sir, for consolidation.

As well as I recollect the course of his remarks, the honorable gentleman next recurred to the subject of the tariff. He did not doubt the word must be of unpleasant sound to me, and proceeded, with an effort neither new nor attended with new success, to involve me and my votes in inconsistency and contradiction. I am happy the honorable gentleman has furnished me an opportunity of a timely remark or two on that subject. I was glad he approached it, for it is a question I enter upon without fear from anybody. The strenuous toil of the gentleman has been to raise an inconsistency between my dissent to the tariff in 1824 and my vote in 1828. It is labor lost. He pays undeserved compliment to my speech in 1824; but this is to raise me high, that my fall, as he would have it, in 1828, may be more signal. Sir, there was no fall. Between the ground I stood on in 1824 and that I took in 1828, there was not only no precipice, but no declivity. It was a change of position to meet new circumstances, but on the same level. A plain tale explains the whole matter. In 1816 I had not acquiesced in the tariff, then supported by South Carolina. To some parts of it, especially, I felt and expressed great repugnance. I held the same opinions in 1820 at the meeting in Faneuil Hall, to which the gentleman has alluded. I said then, and say now, that, as an original question, the authority of

Congress to exercise the revenue power, with direct reference to the protection of manufactures, is a questionable authority, far more questionable, in my judgment, than the power of internal improvements. I must confess, sir, that in one respect some impression has been made on my opinions lately. Mr. Madison's publication has put the power in a very strong light. He has placed it, I must acknowledge, upon grounds of construction and argument which seem impregnable. But, even if the power were doubtful on the face of the Constitution itself, it had been assumed and asserted in the first revenue law ever passed under that same Constitution; and on this ground, as a matter settled by contemporaneous practice, I had refrained from expressing the opinion that the tariff laws transcended constitutional limits, as the gentleman supposes. What I did say at Faneuil Hall, as far as I now remember, was that this was originally matter of doubtful construction. The gentleman himself, I suppose, thinks there is no doubt about it, and that the laws are plainly against the Constitution. Mr. Madison's letters already referred to contain, in my judgment, by far the most able exposition extant of this part of the Constitution. He has satisfied me, so far as the practice of the government had left it an open question.

With a great majority of the Representatives of Massachusetts, I voted against the tariff of 1824. My reasons were then given, and I will not now repeat them. But, notwithstanding our dissent, the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky went for the bill, in almost unbroken column, and it passed. Congress and the President sanctioned it, and it became the law of the land. What,

then, were we to do? Our only option was either to fall in with this settled course of public policy, and accommodate ourselves to it as well as we could, or to embrace the South Carolina doctrine, and talk of nullifying the statute by state interference.

This last alternative did not suit our principles, and of course we adopted the former. In 1827 the subject came again before Congress, on a proposition to afford some relief to the branch of wool and woolens. We looked upon the system of protection as being fixed and settled. The law of 1824 remained. It had gone into full operation, and, in regard to some objects intended by it, perhaps most of them had produced all its expected effects. No man proposed to repeal it, no man attempted to renew the general contest on its principle. But, owing to subsequent and unforeseen occurrences, the benefit intended by it to wool and woolen fabrics had not been realized. Events not known here when the law passed had taken place which defeated its object in that particular respect. A measure was accordingly brought forward to meet this precise deficiency, to remedy this particular defect. It was limited to wool and woolens. Was ever anything more reasonable? If the policy of the tariff laws had become established in principle as the permanent policy of the government, should they not be revised and amended, and made equal, like other laws, as exigencies should arise or justice require? Because we had doubted about adopting the system, were we to refuse to cure its manifest defects after it had been adopted, and when no one attempted its repeal? And this, sir, is the inconsistency so much bruted. I had voted against the tariff of 1824, but it passed; and in 1827 and

1828 I voted to amend it in a point essential to the interest of my constituents. Where is the inconsistency? Could I do otherwise? Sir, does political consistency consist in always giving negative votes? Does it require of a public man to refuse to concur in amending laws because they passed against his consent? Having voted against the tariff originally, does consistency demand that I should do all in my power to maintain an unequal tariff, burdensome to my own constituents in many respects, favorable in none? To consistency of that sort I lay no claim. And there is another sort to which I lay as little, and that is, a kind of consistency by which persons feel themselves as much bound to oppose a proposition after it has become a law of the land as before.

The bill of 1827, limited, as I have said, to the single object in which the tariff of 1824 had manifestly failed in its effect, passed the House of Representatives, but was lost here. We had then the act of 1828. I need not recur to the history of a measure so recent. Its enemies spiced it with whatsoever they thought would render it distasteful; its friends took it, drugged as it was. Vast amounts of property, many millions, had been invested in manufactures, under the inducements of the act of 1824. Events called loudly, as I thought, for further regulation to secure the degree of protection intended by that act. I was disposed to vote for such regulation, and desired nothing more; but certainly was not to be bantered out of my purpose by a threatened augmentation of duty on molasses, put into the bill for the avowed purpose of making it obnoxious. The vote may have been right or wrong, wise or unwise; but it is little less than absurd to allege against it an inconsistency with opposition to the former law.

Sir, as to the general subject of the tariff I have little now to say. Another opportunity may be presented. I remarked the other day that this policy did not begin with us in New England; and yet, sir, New England is charged with vehemence as being favorable, or charged with equal vehemence as being unfavorable, to the tariff policy, just as best suits the time, place, and occasion for making some charge against her. The credulity of the public has been put to its extreme capacity of false impression relative to her conduct in this particular. Through all the South, during the late contest, it was New England policy and a New England administration that were afflicting the country with a tariff beyond all endurance; while, on the other side of the Alleghanies, even the act of 1828 itself, the very sublimated essence of oppression according to Southern opinions, was pronounced to be one of those blessings for which the West was indebted to the "generous South."

With large investments in manufacturing establishments, and many and various interests connected with and dependent on them, it is not to be expected that New England, any more than other portions of the country, will now consent to any measure destructive or highly dangerous. The duty of the government, at the present moment, would seem to be to preserve, not to destroy; to maintain the position which it has assumed; and, for one, I shall feel it an indispensable obligation to hold it steady, as far as in my power, to that degree of protection which it has undertaken to bestow. No more of the tariff.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "When the speech of Mr. Webster of 1824, in which he assigned his reasons for voting against the tariff law of that year, is carefully compared with his speech of 1828, it will be

Professing to be provoked by what he chose to consider a charge made by me against South Carolina, the honorable member, Mr. President, has taken up a new crusade against New England. Leaving altogether the subject of the public lands, in which his success, perhaps, had been neither distinguished nor satisfactory, and letting go, also, of the topic of the tariff, he sallied forth in a general assault on the opinions, politics, and parties of New England as they have been exhibited in the last thirty years. This is natural. The "narrow policy" of the public lands had proved a legal settlement in South Carolina, and was not to be removed. The "accursed policy" of the tariff, also, had established the fact of its birth and parentage in the same State. No wonder, therefore, the gentleman wished to carry the war, as he expressed it, into the enemy's country. Prudently willing to quit these subjects, he was doubtless desirous of fastening on others which could not be transferred south of Mason and Dixon's line. The politics of New England became his theme; and it was in this part of his speech, I think, that he menaced me with such sore discomfiture. Discomfiture! Why, sir, when he attacks anything which I maintain, and overthrows it, when he turns the right or left of any position which I take up, when he drives me from any ground I choose to occupy, he may then talk of discomfiture,

found that there is no other diversity than that which was induced by the change in the state of the country itself in reference to its manufacturing interests, and by the course pursued in reference to the details of the bill by those opposed to protection *in toto*. It is the best proof of this that, in the former editions of Mr. Webster's works, the two speeches were, for more easy comparison, placed side by side." Everett's Biographical Memoir in Webster's *Works*, vol. i. lxxxv.

but not till that distant day. What has he done? Has he maintained his own charges? Has he proved what he alleged? Has he sustained himself in his attack on the government, and on the history of the North, in the matter of the public lands? Has he disproved a fact, refuted a proposition, weakened an argument, maintained by me? Has he come within beat of drum of any position of mine? Oh, no; but he has "carried the war into the enemy's country"! Carried the war into the enemy's country! Yes, sir, and what sort of a war has he made of it? Why, sir, he has stretched a drag-net over the whole surface of perished pamphlets, indiscreet sermons, frothy paragraphs, and fuming popular addresses; over whatever the pulpit in its moments of alarm, the press in its heats, and parties in their extravagances, have severally thrown off in times of general excitement and violence. He has thus swept together a mass of such things as, but that they are now old and cold, the public health would have required him rather to leave in their state of dispersion. For a good long hour or two, we had the unbroken pleasure of listening to the honorable member while he recited, with his usual grace and spirit and with evident high gusto, speeches, pamphlets, addresses, and all the *et ceteras* of the political press, such as warm heads produce in warm times, and such as it would be "discomfiture" indeed for any one whose taste did not delight in that sort of reading to be obliged to peruse. This is his war. This it is to carry the war into the enemy's country. It is in an invasion of this sort that he flatters himself with the expectation of gaining laurels fit to adorn a Senator's brow.

Mr. President, I shall not -- it will not, I trust, be

expected that I should — either now or at any time separate this farrago into parts, and answer and examine its components. I shall barely bestow upon it all a general remark or two. In the run of forty years, sir, under this Constitution, we have experienced sundry successive violent party contests. Party arose, indeed, with the Constitution itself, and, in some form or other, has attended it through the greater part of its history. Whether any other Constitution than the old Articles of Confederation was desirable, was itself a question on which parties divided; if a new Constitution were framed, what powers should be given to it was another question; and when it had been formed, what was, in fact, the just extent of the powers actually conferred was a third. Parties, as we know, existed under the first administration as distinctly marked as those which have manifested themselves at any subsequent period. The contest immediately preceding the political change in 1801, and that, again, which existed at the commencement of the late war, are other instances of party excitement of something more than usual strength and intensity. In all these conflicts there was, no doubt, much of violence on both and all sides. It would be impossible, if one had a fancy for such employment, to adjust the relative *quantum* of violence between these contending parties. There was enough in each, as must always be expected in popular governments. With a great deal of popular and decorous discussion, there was mingled a great deal, also, of declamation, virulence, crimination, and abuse. In regard to any party, probably, at one of the leading epochs in the history of parties, enough may be found to make out another inflamed exhibition not unlike that with which the honorable

member has edified us. For myself, sir, I shall not rake among the rubbish of bygone times to see what I can find, or whether I cannot find something by which I can fix a blot on the escutcheon of any State, any party, or any part of the country. General Washington's administration was steadily and zealously maintained, as we all know, by New England. It was violently opposed elsewhere. We know in what quarter he had the most earnest, constant, and persevering support in all his great and leading measures. We know where his private and personal character was held in the highest degree of attachment and veneration; and we know, too, where his measures were opposed, his services slighted, and his character vilified. We know, or we might know if we turned to the journals, who expressed respect, gratitude, and regret when he retired from the chief magistracy, and who refused to express either respect, gratitude, or regret. I shall not open those journals. Publications more abusive or scurrilous never saw the light than were sent forth against Washington, and all his leading measures, from presses south of New England. But I shall not look them up. I employ no scavengers; no one is in attendance on me, furnishing such means of retaliation; and if there were, with an ass's load of them, with a bulk as huge as that which the gentleman himself has produced, I would not touch one of them. I see enough of the violence of our own times to be no way anxious to rescue from forgetfulness the extravagances of times past.

Besides, what is all this to the present purpose? It has nothing to do with the public lands, in regard to which the attack was begun; and it has nothing to

do with those sentiments and opinions which, I have thought, tend to disunion, and all of which the honorable member seems to have adopted himself, and undertaken to defend. New England has at times — so argues the gentleman — held opinions as dangerous as those which he now holds. Suppose this were so; why should *he* therefore abuse New England? If he finds himself countenanced by acts of hers, how is it that, while he relies on these acts, he covers, or seeks to cover, their authors with reproach? But, sir, if in the course of forty years there have been undue effervescences of party in New England, has the same thing happened nowhere else? Party animosity and party outrage, not in New England, but elsewhere, denounced President Washington, not only as a Federalist, but as a Tory, a British agent, a man who in his high office sanctioned corruption. But does the honorable member suppose, if I had a tender here who should put such an effusion of wickedness and folly into my hand, that I would stand up and read it against the South? Parties ran into great heats again in 1799 and 1800. What was said, sir, or rather what was not said, in those years, against John Adams, one of the committee that drafted the Declaration of Independence, and its admitted ablest defender on the floor of Congress? If the gentleman wishes to increase his stores of party abuse and frothy violence, if he has a determined proclivity to such pursuits, there are treasures of that sort south of the Potomac, much to his taste, yet untouched. I shall not touch them.

The parties which divided the country at the commencement of the late war were violent. But then there was violence on both sides, and violence in every State. Minorities and majorities were equally violent.

There was no more violence against the war in New England than in other States; nor any more appearance of violence, except that, owing to a dense population, greater facility of assembling, and more presses, there may have been more in quantity spoken and printed there than in some other places. In the article of sermons, too, New England is somewhat more abundant than South Carolina; and for that reason the chance of finding here and there an exceptionable one may be greater. I hope, too, there are more good ones. Opposition may have been more formidable in New England, as it embraced a larger portion of the whole population; but it was no more unrestrained in principle or violent in manner. The minorities dealt quite as harshly with their own State governments as the majorities dealt with the administration here. There were presses on both sides, popular meetings on both sides, ay, and pulpits on both sides also. The gentleman's purveyors have only catered for him among the productions of one side. I certainly shall not supply the deficiency by furnishing samples of the other. I leave to him and to them the whole concern.

It is enough for me to say that if, in any part of this their grateful occupation, if, in all their researches they find anything in the history of Massachusetts or New England, or in the proceedings of any legislative or other public body, disloyal to the Union, speaking slightingly of its value, proposing to break it up, or recommending non-intercourse with neighboring States, on account of difference of political opinion, then, sir, I give them all up to the honorable gentleman's unrestrained rebuke; expecting, however, that he will extend his buffetings in like manner to all similar proceedings wherever else found.

The gentleman, sir, has spoken at large of former parties, now no longer in being, by their received appellations, and has undertaken to instruct us not only in the knowledge of their principles, but of their respective pedigrees also. He has ascended to their origin, and run out their genealogies. With most exemplary modesty he speaks of the party to which he professes to have himself belonged as the true Pure, the only honest, patriotic party, derived, by regular descent from father to son, from the time of the virtuous Romans! Spreading before us the family tree of political parties, he takes especial care to show himself snugly perched on a popular bough! He is wakeful to the expediency of adopting such rules of descent as shall bring him in, to the exclusion of others, as an heir to the inheritance of all public virtue and all true political principle. His party and his opinions are sure to be orthodox; heterodoxy is confined to his opponents. He spoke, sir, of the Federalists, and I thought I saw some eyes begin to open and stare a little when he ventured on that ground. I expected he would draw his sketches rather lightly when he looked on the circle round him, and especially if he should cast his thoughts to the high places out of the Senate. Nevertheless, he went back to Rome, *ad annum urbis conditæ*,<sup>1</sup> and found the fathers of the Federalists in the primeval aristocrats of that renowned city. He traced the flow of Federal blood down through successive ages and centuries till he brought it into the veins of the American Tories, of whom, by the way, there were twenty in the Carolinas for one in Massachusetts. From the Tories he fol-

<sup>1</sup> In the year of the city's foundation; "In the year one," in colloquial speech.

lowed it to the Federalists ; and, as the Federal party was broken up, and there was no possibility of transmitting it further on this side the Atlantic, he seems to have discovered that it has gone off collaterally, though against all canons of descent, into the Ultras of France, and finally become extinguished, like exploded gas, among the adherents of Dom Miguel!<sup>1</sup> This, sir, is an abstract of the gentleman's history of Federalism. I am not about to controvert it. It is not at present worth the pains of refutation ; because, sir, if at this day any one feels the sin of Federalism lying heavily on his conscience, he can easily procure remission. He may even obtain an indulgence, if he be desirous of repeating the same transgression. It is an affair of no difficulty to get into this same right line of patriotic descent. A man nowadays is at liberty to choose his political parentage. He may elect his own father. Federalist or not, he may, if he choose, claim to belong to the favored stock, and his claim will be allowed. He may carry back his pretensions just as far as the honorable gentleman himself ; nay, he may make himself out the honorable gentleman's cousin, and prove satisfactorily that he is descended from the same political great-grandfather. All this is allowable. We all know a process, sir, by which the whole Essex Junto<sup>2</sup> could in one hour be all washed white

<sup>1</sup> Dom Miguel, the head of the Absolutists, had in 1828 usurped the throne of Portugal. His niece, Maria da Gloria, was restored in 1833.

<sup>2</sup> The name is as old as 1781, when John Hancock applied it to a group of public men of Essex County, Massachusetts. The name was moribund when John Adams revived it. In its widest sense, it applied to the extreme Federalism displayed during the War of 1812 and in the Hartford Convention. Fisher Ames, George Cabot, and Timothy Pickering were prominent members.

from their ancient Federalism, and come out, every one of them, original democrats dyed in the wool! Some of them have actually undergone the operation, and they say it is quite easy.<sup>1</sup> The only inconvenience it occasions, as they tell us, is a slight tendency of the blood to the face, a soft suffusion, which, however, is very transient, since nothing is said by those whom they join calculated to deepen the red on the cheek, but a prudent silence is observed in regard to all the past. Indeed, sir, some smiles of approbation have been bestowed, and some crumbs of comfort have fallen, not a thousand miles from the door of the Hartford Convention. And if the author of the Ordinance of 1787 possessed the other requisite qualifications, there is no knowing, notwithstanding his Federalism, to what heights of favor he might not yet attain.

Mr. President, in carrying his warfare, such as it is, into New England, the honorable gentleman, all along, professes to be acting on the defensive. He chooses to consider me as having assailed South Carolina, and insists that he comes forth only as her champion and in her defense. Sir, I do not admit that I made any attack whatever on South Carolina. Nothing like it. The honorable member, in his first speech, expressed opinions in regard to revenue and some other topics.

Henry Cabot Lodge's *Life of George Cabot* has softened some of the legends which had attached themselves to this black beast of New England politics.

<sup>1</sup> This may refer to Harrison Gray Otis, who became a candidate for the office of first Mayor of Boston in 1822. On account of his record during the War of 1812 and as a member of the Hartford Convention, his name was withdrawn; but he was elected mayor in 1829, when he made an explanation of his political course.

which I heard both with pain and with surprise. I told the gentleman I was aware that such sentiments were entertained *out* of the government, but had not expected to find them advanced in it; that I knew there were persons in the South who speak of our Union with indifference or doubt, taking pains to magnify its evils and to say nothing of its benefits; that the honorable member himself, I was sure, could never be one of these; and I regretted the expression of such opinions as he had avowed, because I thought their obvious tendency was to encourage feelings of disrespect to the Union, and to impair its strength. This, sir, is the sum and substance of all I said on the subject. And this constitutes the attack which called on the chivalry of the gentleman, in his own opinion, to harry us with such a foray among the party pamphlets and party proceedings of Massachusetts! If he means that I spoke with dissatisfaction or disrespect of the ebullitions of individuals in South Carolina, it is true. But if he means that I assailed the character of the State, her honor or patriotism, that I reflected on her history or her conduct, he has not the slightest ground for any such assumption. I did not even refer, I think, in my observations, to any collection of individuals. I said nothing of the recent conventions. I spoke in the most guarded and careful manner, and only expressed my regret for the publication of opinions which I presumed the honorable member disapproved as much as myself. In this, it seems, I was mistaken. I do not remember that the gentleman has disclaimed any sentiment or any opinion of a supposed anti-Union tendency which on all or any of the recent occasions has been expressed. The whole drift of his speech has been rather to prove that, in divers times

and manners, sentiments equally liable to my objection have been avowed in New England. And one would suppose that his object, in this reference to Massachusetts, was to find a precedent to justify proceedings in the South, were it not for the reproach and contumely with which he labors, all along, to load these his own chosen precedents. By way of defending South Carolina from what he chooses to think an attack on her, he first quotes the example of Massachusetts, and then denounces that example in good set terms. This twofold purpose, not very consistent, one would think, with itself, was exhibited more than once in the course of his speech. He referred, for instance, to the Hartford Convention. Did he do this for authority, or for a topic of reproach? Apparently for both; for he told us that he should find no fault with the mere fact of holding such a convention, and considering and discussing such questions as he supposes were then and there discussed; but what rendered it obnoxious was its being held at the time, and the circumstances of the country then existing. We were in a war, he said, and the country needed all our aid; the hand of government required to be strengthened, not weakened; and patriotism should have postponed such proceedings to another day. The thing itself, then, is a precedent; the time and manner of it only, a subject of censure.

Now, sir, I go much further on this point than the honorable member. Supposing, as the gentleman seems to do, that the Hartford Convention assembled for any such purpose as breaking up the Union because they thought unconstitutional laws had been passed, or to consult on that subject, or to calculate the value of the Union, — supposing this to be their

purpose, or any part of it, then, I say, the meeting itself was disloyal, and was obnoxious to censure, whether held in time of peace or time of war, or under whatever circumstances. The material question is the object. Is dissolution the object? If it be, external circumstances may make it a more or less aggravated case, but cannot affect the principle. I do not hold, therefore, sir, that the Hartford Convention was pardonable, even to the extent of the gentleman's admission, if its objects were really such as have been imputed to it. Sir, there never was a time, under any degree of excitement, in which the Hartford Convention, or any other convention, could have maintained itself one moment in New England, if assembled for any such purpose as the gentleman says would have been an allowable purpose. To hold conventions to decide constitutional law! To try the binding validity of statutes by votes in a convention! Sir, the Hartford Convention, I presume, would not desire that the honorable gentleman should be their defender or advocate if he puts their case upon such untenable and extravagant grounds.

Then, sir, the gentleman has no fault to find with these recently promulgated South Carolina opinions. And certainly he need have none; for his own sentiments, as now advanced and advanced on reflection, as far as I have been able to comprehend them, go the full length of all these opinions. I propose, sir, to say something on these, and to consider how far they are just and constitutional. Before doing that, however, let me observe that the eulogium pronounced by the honorable gentleman on the character of the State of South Carolina for her Revolutionary and other merits meets my hearty concurrence. I shall not

acknowledge that the honorable member goes before me in regard for whatever of distinguished talent, or distinguished character, South Carolina has produced. I claim part of the honor, I partake in the pride, of her great names. I claim them for countrymen, one and all, — the Laurenses,<sup>1</sup> the Rutledges, the Pinckneys, the Sumters, the Marions, Americans all, whose fame is no more to be hemmed in by State lines than their talents and patriotism were capable of being circumscribed within the same narrow limits. In their day and generation they served and honored the country, and the whole country ; and their renown is of the treasures of the whole country. Him whose honored name the gentleman himself bears,<sup>2</sup> — does he esteem me less capable of gratitude for his patriotism, or sympathy for his sufferings, than if his eyes had first opened upon the light of Massachusetts instead of South Carolina? Sir, does he suppose it in his power to exhibit a Carolina name so bright as to produce

<sup>1</sup> John Laurens was an aide to Washington, and was called the “Bayard of the Revolution.” Governor John and Edward Rutledge both served in the Revolution, as did Charles Cotesworth and Thomas Pinckney, who also were brothers. Sir Banastre Tarleton referred to General Thomas Sumter as the “gamecock,” and Francis Marion as the “swamp-fox.” See note on page 63 of Hayne’s Speech.

<sup>2</sup> Isaac Hayne, great-uncle of Robert Y. Hayne, was hanged by the joint order of Colonel Balfour and Lord Rawdon, both of whom afterward denied responsibility for the act. Hayne, for honorable reasons, had taken the British oath of allegiance, on condition that he should not be obliged to bear arms ; he was, however, coerced into service. He therefore broke his parole, became an American officer, was captured by the British, and met an unjust fate. In the *Southern Review* for 1828 (vol. i.) is an article by Robert Y. Hayne on the execution of Colonel Hayne, largely in answer to Lord Rawdon’s attempted justification.

envy in my bosom? No, sir, increased gratification and delight, rather. I thank God that, if I am gifted with little of the spirit which is able to raise mortals to the skies, I have yet none, as I trust, of that other spirit which would drag angels down. When I shall be found, sir, in my place here in the Senate or elsewhere, to sneer at public merit because it happens to spring up beyond the little limits of my own State or neighborhood; when I refuse, for any such cause, or for any cause, the homage due to American talent, to elevated patriotism, to sincere devotion to liberty and the country; or, if I see an uncommon endowment of Heaven, if I see extraordinary capacity and virtue in any son of the South, and if, moved by local prejudice or gangrened by State jealousy, I get up here to abate the tithe of a hair from his just character and just fame, — may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth!

Sir, let me recur to pleasing recollections; let me indulge in refreshing remembrance of the past; let me remind you that, in early times, no States cherished greater harmony, both of principle and feeling, than Massachusetts and South Carolina. Would to God that harmony might again return! Shoulder to shoulder they went through the Revolution; hand in hand they stood round the administration of Washington, and felt his own great arm lean on them for support. Unkind feeling, if it exist, alienation and distrust, are the growth, unnatural to such soils, of false principles since sown. They are weeds, the seeds of which that same great arm never scattered.

Mr. President, I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts; she needs none. There she is. Behold her, and judge for yourselves. There is her

history ; the world knows it by heart. The past, at least, is secure. There is Boston, and Concord, and Lexington, and Bunker Hill ; and there they will remain forever. The bones of her sons, falling in the great struggle for independence, now lie mingled with the soil of every State from New England to Georgia ; and there they will lie forever. And, sir, where American liberty raised its first voice, and where its youth was nurtured and sustained, there it still lives in the strength of its manhood and full of its original spirit. If discord and disunion shall wound it ; if party strife and blind ambition shall hawk at and tear it ; if folly and madness, if uneasiness under salutary and necessary restraint, shall succeed in separating it from that Union by which alone its existence is made sure, — it will stand, in the end, by the side of that cradle in which its infancy was rocked ; it will stretch forth its arm with whatever of vigor it may still retain over the friends who gather round it ; and it will fall at last, if fall it must, amidst the proudest monuments of its own glory, and on the very spot of its origin.

There yet remains to be performed, Mr. President, by far the most grave and important duty which I feel to be devolved on me by this occasion. It is to state and to defend what I conceive to be the true principles of the Constitution under which we are here assembled. I might well have desired that so weighty a task should have fallen into other and abler hands. I could have wished that it should have been executed by those whose character and experience give weight and influence to their opinions, such as cannot possibly belong to mine. But, sir, I have met the occasion, not sought it ; and I shall proceed to state my own

sentiments, without challenging for them any particular regard, with studied plainness, and as much precision as possible.

I understand the honorable gentlemen from South Carolina to maintain that it is a right of the State legislatures to interfere whenever, in their judgment, this government transcends its constitutional limits, and to arrest the operation of its laws.

I understand him to maintain this right as a right existing *under* the Constitution, not as a right to overthrow it on the ground of extreme necessity, such as would justify violent revolution.

I understand him to maintain an authority, on the part of the States, thus to interfere for the purpose of correcting the exercise of power by the general government, of checking it, and of compelling it to conform to their opinion of the extent of its powers.

I understand him to maintain that the ultimate power of judging of the constitutional extent of its own authority is not lodged exclusively in the general government or any branch of it; but that, on the contrary, the States may lawfully decide for themselves, and each State for itself, whether, in a given case, the act of the general government transcends its power.

I understand him to insist that, if the exigency of the case, in the opinion of any State government, require it, such State government may, by its own sovereign authority, annul an act of the general government which it deems plainly and palpably unconstitutional.

This is the sum of what I understand from him to be the South Carolina doctrine, and the doctrine which he maintains. I propose to consider it, and compare

it with the Constitution. Allow me to say, as a preliminary remark, that I call this the South Carolina doctrine only because the gentleman himself has so denominated it. I do not feel at liberty to say that South Carolina, as a State, has ever advanced these sentiments. I hope she has not, and never may. That a great majority of her people are opposed to the tariff laws is doubtless true. That a majority, somewhat less than that just mentioned, conscientiously believe these laws unconstitutional, may probably also be true. But that any majority holds to the right of direct State interference at State discretion, the right of nullifying acts of Congress by acts of State legislation, is more than I know and what I shall be slow to believe.

That there are individuals besides the honorable gentleman who do maintain these opinions, is quite certain. I recollect the recent expression of a sentiment which circumstances attending its utterance and publication justify us in supposing was not unpremeditated: "The sovereignty of the State, — never to be controlled, construed, or decided on but by her own feelings of honorable justice."

[Mr. HAYNE here rose and said that, for the purpose of being clearly understood, he would state that his proposition was in the words of the Virginia Resolution, as follows: —

"That this Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare, that it views the powers of the federal government, as resulting from the compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact, as no farther valid than they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that, in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise

of other powers not granted by the said compact, the States who are parties thereto have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them.”]

Mr. WEBSTER resumed : —

I am quite aware, Mr. President, of the existence of the resolution which the gentleman read, and has now repeated, and that he relies on it as his authority. I know the source, too, from which it is understood to have proceeded. I need not say that I have much respect for the constitutional opinions of Mr. Madison ; they would weigh greatly with me always. But, before the authority of his opinion be vouched for the gentleman’s proposition, it will be proper to consider what is the fair interpretation of that resolution to which Mr. Madison is understood to have given his sanction. As the gentleman construes it, it is an authority for him. Possibly he may not have adopted the right construction. That resolution declares *that, in the case of the dangerous exercise of powers not granted by the general government, the States may interpose to arrest the progress of the evil.* But how interpose, and what does this declaration purport ? Does it mean no more than that there may be extreme cases in which the people, in any mode of assembling, may resist usurpation and relieve themselves from a tyrannical government ? No one will deny this. Such resistance is not only acknowledged to be just in America, but in England also. Blackstone admits as much in the theory, and practice too, of the English constitution. We, sir, who oppose the Carolina doctrine do not deny that the people may, if they choose, throw

off any government when it becomes oppressive and intolerable, and erect a better in its stead. We all know that civil institutions are established for the public benefit, and that, when they cease to answer the ends of their existence, they may be changed. But I do not understand the doctrine now contended for to be that which, for the sake of distinctness, we may call the right of revolution. I understand the gentleman to maintain that without revolution, without civil commotion, without rebellion, a remedy for supposed abuse and transgression of the powers of the general government lies in a direct appeal to the interference of the State governments.

[Mr. HAYNE here rose and said: He did not contend for the mere right of revolution, but for the right of constitutional resistance. What he maintained was that, in case of a plain, palpable violation of the Constitution by the general government, a State may interpose, and that this interposition is constitutional.]

Mr. WEBSTER resumed:—

So, sir, I understood the gentleman, and am happy to find that I did not misunderstand him. What he contends for is, that it is constitutional to interrupt the administration of the Constitution itself, in the hands of those who are chosen and sworn to administer it, by the direct interference, in form of law, of the States, in virtue of their sovereign capacity.

The inherent right in the people to reform their government I do not deny; and they have another right, and that is, to resist unconstitutional laws without overturning the government. It is no doctrine of mine that unconstitutional laws bind the people. The great question is, Whose prerogative is it to decide on the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the laws? On that, the main debate hinges.

The proposition that, in case of a supposed violation of the Constitution by Congress, the States have a constitutional right to interfere and annul the law of Congress, is the proposition of the gentleman. I do not admit it. If the gentleman had intended no more than to assert the right of revolution for justifiable cause, he would have said only what all agree to. But I cannot conceive that there can be a middle course between submission to the laws, when regularly pronounced constitutional, on the one hand, and open resistance, which is revolution or rebellion, on the other. I say the right of a State to annul a law of Congress cannot be maintained but on the ground of the inalienable right of man to resist oppression; that is to say, upon the ground of revolution. I admit that there is an ultimate violent remedy, above the Constitution and in defiance of the Constitution, which may be resorted to when a revolution is to be justified. But I do not admit that, under the Constitution and in conformity with it, there is any mode in which a State government, as a member of the Union, can interfere and stop the progress of the general government by force of her own laws, under any circumstances whatever.

This leads us to inquire into the origin of this government and the source of its power. Whose agent is it? Is it the creature of the State legislatures, or the creature of the people? If the government of the United States be the agent of the State governments, then they may control it, provided they can agree in the manner of controlling it; if it be the agent of the people, then the people alone can control it, restrain it, modify or reform it. It is observable enough that the doctrine for which the honorable gentleman con-

tends leads him to the necessity of maintaining not only that this general government is the creature of the States, but that it is the creature of each of the States severally, so that each may assert the power for itself of determining whether it acts within the limits of its authority. It is the servant of four-and-twenty masters, of different wills and different purposes, and yet bound to obey all. This absurdity (for it seems no less) arises from a misconception as to the origin of this government and its true character. It is, sir, the people's Constitution, the people's government, made for the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people.<sup>1</sup> The people of the United States have declared that this Constitution shall be the supreme law. We must either admit the proposition or dispute their authority. The States are unquestionably sovereign, so far as their sovereignty is not affected by this supreme law. But the State legislatures, as political bodies, however sovereign, are yet not sovereign over the people. So far as the people have given power to the general government, so far the grant is unquestionably good, and the government holds of the people, and not of the State governments. We are all agents of the same supreme power, the people. The general government and the State governments derive their authority from the same source. Neither can, in relation to the other, be called primary, though one is definite and restricted,

<sup>1</sup> Compare with Theodore Parker's "A government of all the people, by all the people, for all the people" (Speech, May 29, 1850) and Abraham Lincoln's still simpler "government of the people, by the people, for the people" (Gettysburg address, November 19, 1863). See an interesting statement in Herndon and Weik's *Lincoln*, ii. 396.

and the other general and residuary. The national government possesses those powers which it can be shown the people have conferred on it, and no more. All the rest belongs to the State governments, or to the people themselves. So far as the people have restrained State sovereignty, by the expression of their will, in the Constitution of the United States, so far, it must be admitted, State sovereignty is effectually controlled. I do not contend that it is, or ought to be, controlled farther. The sentiment to which I have referred propounds that State sovereignty is only to be controlled by its own "feeling of justice;" that is to say, it is not to be controlled at all, for one who is to follow his own feelings is under no legal control. Now, however men may think this ought to be, the fact is that the people of the United States have chosen to impose control on State sovereignties. There are those, doubtless, who wish they had been left without restraint; but the Constitution has ordered the matter differently. To make war, for instance, is an exercise of sovereignty; but the Constitution declares that no State shall make war. To coin money is another exercise of sovereign power; but no State is at liberty to coin money. Again, the Constitution says that no sovereign State shall be so sovereign as to make a treaty. These prohibitions, it must be confessed, are a control on the State sovereignty of South Carolina, as well as of the other States, which does not arise "from her own feelings of honorable justice." The opinion referred to, therefore, is in defiance of the plainest provisions of the Constitution.

There are other proceedings of public bodies which have already been alluded to, and to which I refer again for the purpose of ascertaining more fully what

is the length and breadth of that doctrine denominated the Carolina doctrine, which the honorable member has now stood up on this floor to maintain. In one of them I find it resolved that "the tariff of 1828, and every other tariff designed to promote one branch of industry at the expense of others, is contrary to the meaning and intention of the Federal compact; and such a dangerous, palpable, and deliberate usurpation of power, by a determined majority wielding the general government beyond the limits of its delegated powers, as calls upon the States which compose the suffering minority, in their sovereign capacity, to exercise the powers which, as sovereigns, necessarily devolve upon them when their compact is violated."

Observe, sir, that this resolution holds the tariff of 1828, and every other tariff designed to promote one branch of industry at the expense of another, to be such a dangerous, palpable, and deliberate usurpation of power as calls upon the States, in their sovereign capacity, to interfere by their own authority. This denunciation, Mr. President, you will please to observe, includes our old tariff of 1816 as well as all others; because that was established to promote the interest of the manufacturers of cotton to the manifest and admitted injury of the Calcutta cotton trade. Observe, again, that all the qualifications are here rehearsed and charged upon the tariff which are necessary to bring the case within the gentleman's proposition. The tariff is a usurpation: it is a dangerous usurpation; it is a palpable usurpation: it is a deliberate usurpation. It is such a usurpation, therefore, as calls upon the States to exercise their right of interference. Here is a case, then, within the gentleman's principles, and all his qualifications of his principles.

It is a case for action. The Constitution is plainly, dangerously, palpably, and deliberately violated; and the States must interpose their own authority to arrest the law. Let us suppose the State of South Carolina to express this same opinion by the voice of her legislature. That would be very imposing; but what then? Is the voice of one State conclusive? It so happens that, at the very moment when South Carolina resolves that the tariff laws are unconstitutional, Pennsylvania and Kentucky resolve exactly the reverse. They hold those laws to be both highly proper and strictly constitutional. And now, sir, how does the honorable member propose to deal with this case? How does he relieve us from this difficulty upon any principle of his? His construction gets us into it; how does he propose to get us out?

In Carolina the tariff is a palpable, deliberate usurpation; Carolina, therefore, may nullify it and refuse to pay the duties. In Pennsylvania it is both clearly constitutional and highly expedient, and there the duties are to be paid. And yet we live under a government of uniform laws, and under a Constitution, too, which contains an express provision, as it happens, that all duties shall be equal in all the States. Does not this approach absurdity?

If there be no power to settle such questions, independent of either of the States, is not the whole Union a rope of sand? Are we not thrown back again, precisely, upon the old Confederation?

It is too plain to be argued. Four-and-twenty interpreters of constitutional law, each with a power to decide for itself, and none with authority to bind anybody else, and this constitutional law the only bond of their union! What is such a state of things but a

mere connection during pleasure, or, to use the phraseology of the times, *during feeling*? And that feeling, too, not the feeling of the people who established the Constitution, but the feeling of the State governments.

In another of the South Carolina addresses, having premised that the crisis requires "all the concentrated energy of passion," an attitude of open resistance to the laws of the Union is advised. Open resistance to the laws, then, is the constitutional remedy, the conservative power of the State, which the South Carolina doctrines teach for the redress of political evils, real or imaginary. And its authors further say that, appealing with confidence to the Constitution itself to justify their opinions, they cannot consent to try their accuracy by the courts of justice. In one sense, indeed, sir, this is assuming an attitude of open resistance in favor of liberty. But what sort of liberty? The liberty of establishing their own opinions in defiance of the opinions of all others; the liberty of judging and of deciding exclusively themselves in a matter in which others have as much right to judge and decide as they; the liberty of placing their own opinions above the judgment of all others, above the laws, and above the Constitution. This is their liberty, and this is the fair result of the proposition contended for by the honorable gentleman. Or, it may be more properly said, it is identical with it, rather than a result from it.

In the same publication, we find the following: "Previously to our Revolution, when the arm of oppression was stretched over New England, where did our Northern brethren meet with a braver sympathy than that which sprung from the bosoms of Carolinians? We had no extortion, no oppression, no colli-

sion with the King's ministers, no navigation interests springing up, in envious rivalry of England."

This seems extraordinary language. South Carolina no collision with the King's ministers in 1775! No extortion! No oppression! But, sir, it is also most significant language. Does any man doubt the purpose for which it was penned? Can any one fail to see that it was designed to raise in the reader's mind the question whether, at this time, — that is to say in 1828, — South Carolina has any collision with the King's ministers, any oppression or extortion to fear from England? Whether, in short, England is not as naturally the friend of South Carolina as New England, with her navigation interests springing up in envious rivalry of England?

Is it not strange, sir, that an intelligent man in South Carolina, in 1828, should thus labor to prove that in 1775 there was no hostility, no cause of war, between South Carolina and England? That she had no occasion, in reference to her own interest or from a regard to her own welfare, to take up arms in the Revolutionary contest? Can any one account for the expression of such strange sentiments and their circulation through the State, otherwise than by supposing the object to be what I have already intimated, to raise the question, if they had no "collision" (mark the expression) with the ministers of King George the Third in 1775, what collision have they in 1828 with the ministers of King George the Fourth? What is there now, in the existing state of things, to separate Carolina from Old, more or rather than from New England?

Resolutions, sir, have been recently passed by the legislature of South Carolina. I need not refer to

them; they go no farther than the honorable gentleman himself has gone, and I hope not so far. I content myself, therefore, with debating the matter with him.

And now, sir, what I have first to say on this subject is, that at no time and under no circumstances has New England, or any State in New England, or any respectable body of persons in New England, or any public man of standing in New England, put forth such a doctrine as this Carolina doctrine.

The gentleman has found no case, he can find none, to support his own opinions by New England authority. New England has studied the Constitution in other schools and under other teachers. She looks upon it with other regards, and deems more highly and reverently both of its just authority and its utility and excellence. The history of her legislative proceedings may be traced. The ephemeral effusions of temporary bodies, called together by the excitement of the occasion, may be hunted up; they have been hunted up. The opinions and votes of her public men, in and out of Congress, may be explored. It will all be in vain. The Carolina doctrine can derive from her neither countenance nor support. She rejects it now; she always did reject it; and till she loses her senses she always will reject it. The honorable member has referred to expressions on the subject of the Embargo law made in this place by an honorable and venerable gentleman,<sup>1</sup> now favoring us with his presence. He quotes that distinguished Senator as saying that, in his judgment, the Embargo law was unconstitutional, and that therefore, in his

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hillhouse of Connecticut. See note on page 99 of Hayne's Speech.

opinion, the people were not bound to obey it. That, sir, is perfectly constitutional language. An unconstitutional law is not binding; *but then it does not rest with a resolution or a law of a State legislature to decide whether an act of Congress be or be not constitutional.* An unconstitutional act of Congress would not bind the people of this District, although they have no legislature to interfere in their behalf; and, on the other hand, a constitutional law of Congress does bind the citizens of every State, although all their legislatures should undertake to annul it by act or resolution. The venerable Connecticut Senator is a constitutional lawyer of sound principles and enlarged knowledge; a statesman practiced and experienced, bred in the company of Washington, and holding just views upon the nature of our governments. He believed the Embargo unconstitutional, and so did others; but what then? Who did he suppose was to decide that question? The State legislatures? Certainly not. No such sentiment ever escaped his lips.

Let us follow up, sir, this New England opposition to the Embargo laws; let us trace it till we discern the principle which controlled and governed New England throughout the whole course of that opposition. We shall then see what similarity there is between the New England school of constitutional opinions and this modern Carolina school. The gentleman, I think, read a petition from some single individual, addressed to the legislature of Massachusetts, asserting the Carolina doctrine; that is, the right of State interference to arrest the laws of the Union. The fate of that petition shows the sentiment of the legislature. It met no favor. The opinions of Massachusetts were very different. They had been

expressed in 1798, in answer to the resolutions of Virginia, and she did not depart from them nor bend them to the times. Misgoverned, wronged, oppressed, as she felt herself to be, she still held fast her integrity to the Union. The gentleman may find in her proceedings much evidence of dissatisfaction with the measures of government, and great and deep dislike to the Embargo: all this makes the case so much the stronger for her; for, notwithstanding all this dissatisfaction and dislike, she still claimed no right to sever the bonds of the Union. There was heat and there was anger in her political feeling. Be it so; but neither her heat nor her anger betrayed her into infidelity to the government. The gentleman labors to prove that she disliked the Embargo as much as South Carolina dislikes the tariff, and expressed her dislike as strongly. Be it so; but did she propose the Carolina remedy? Did she threaten to interfere, by State authority, to annul the laws of the Union? That is the question for the gentleman's consideration.

No doubt, sir, a great majority of the people of New England conscientiously believed the Embargo law of 1807 unconstitutional; as conscientiously, certainly, as the people of South Carolina hold that opinion of the tariff. They reasoned thus: Congress has power to regulate commerce; but here is a law, they said, stopping all commerce and stopping it indefinitely. The law is perpetual; that is, it is not limited in point of time, and must of course continue until it shall be repealed by some other law. It is as perpetual, therefore, as the law against treason or murder. Now is this regulating commerce or destroying it? Is it guiding, controlling, giving the rule to commerce as a subsisting thing, or is it putting an

end to it altogether? Nothing is more certain than that a majority in New England deemed this law a violation of the Constitution. The very case required by the gentleman to justify State interference had then arisen. Massachusetts believed this law to be "a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of a power not granted by the Constitution." Deliberate it was, for it was long continued; palpable she thought it, as no words in the Constitution gave the power, and only a construction, in her opinion most violent, raised it; dangerous it was, since it threatened utter ruin to her most important interests. Here, then, was a Carolina case. How did Massachusetts deal with it? It was, as she thought, a plain, manifest, palpable violation of the Constitution, and it brought ruin to her doors. Thousands of families, and hundreds of thousands of individuals, were beggared by it. While she saw and felt all this, she saw and felt also that, as a measure of national policy, it was perfectly futile; that the country was no way benefited by that which caused so much individual distress; that it was efficient only for the production of evil, and all that evil inflicted on ourselves. In such a case, under such circumstances, how did Massachusetts demean herself? Sir, she remonstrated, she memorialized, she addressed herself to the general government, not exactly "with the concentrated energy of passion," but with her own strong sense and the energy of sober conviction. But she did not interpose the arm of her own power to arrest the law and break the Embargo. Far from it. Her principles bound her to two things; and she followed her principles, lead where they might, — First, to submit to every constitutional law of Congress; and,

second, if the constitutional validity of the law be doubted, to refer that question to the decision of the proper tribunals. The first principle is vain and ineffectual without the second. A majority of us in New England believed the Embargo law unconstitutional; but the great question was, and always will be in such cases, Who is to decide this? Who is to judge between the people and the government? And, sir, it is quite plain that the Constitution of the United States confers on the government itself, to be exercised by its appropriate department and under its own responsibility to the people, this power of deciding ultimately and conclusively upon the just extent of its own authority. If this had not been done, we should not have advanced a single step beyond the old Confederation.

Being fully of opinion that the Embargo law was unconstitutional, the people of New England were yet equally clear in the opinion (it was a matter they did not doubt upon) that the question, after all, must be decided by the judicial tribunals of the United States. Before those tribunals, therefore, they brought the question. Under the provisions of the law they had given bonds to millions in amount, and which were alleged to be forfeited. They suffered the bonds to be sued, and thus raised the question. In the old-fashioned way of settling disputes, they went to law. The case came to hearing and solemn argument; and he who espoused their cause, and stood up for them against the validity of the Embargo Act, was none other than that great man, of whom the gentleman has made honorable mention, Samuel Dexter.<sup>1</sup> He was then, sir, in the fullness of his knowledge and

<sup>1</sup> See note on page 80 of Hayne's Speech.

the maturity of his strength. He had retired from long and distinguished public service here to the renewed pursuit of professional duties, carrying with him all that enlargement and expansion, all the new strength and force, which an acquaintance with the more general subjects discussed in the national councils is capable of adding to professional attainment, in a mind of true greatness and comprehension. He was a lawyer and he was also a statesman. He had studied the Constitution, when he filled public station, that he might defend it. He had examined its principles that he might maintain them. More than all men, or at least as much as any man, he was attached to the general government and to the union of the States. His feelings and opinions all ran in that direction. A question of constitutional law, too, was, of all subjects, that one which was best suited to his talents and learning. Aloof from technicality, and unfettered by artificial rule, such a question gave opportunity for that deep and clear analysis, that mighty grasp of principle, which so much distinguished his higher efforts. His very statement was argument; his inference seemed demonstration. The earnestness of his own conviction wrought conviction in others. One was convinced, and believed, and assented because it was gratifying, delightful, to think, and feel, and believe in unison with an intellect of such evident superiority.

Mr. Dexter, sir, such as I have described him, argued the New England cause. He put into his effort his whole heart as well as all the powers of his understanding; for he had avowed, in the most public manner, his entire concurrence with his neighbors on the point in dispute. He argued the cause: it was

lost, and New England submitted. The established tribunals pronounced the law constitutional, and New England acquiesced. Now, sir, is not this the exact opposite of the doctrine of the gentleman from South Carolina? According to him, instead of referring to the judicial tribunals, we should have broken up the Embargo by laws of our own; we should have repealed it, *quoad* New England; for we had a strong, palpable, and oppressive case. Sir, we believed the Embargo unconstitutional; but still that was matter of opinion, and who was to decide it? We thought it a clear case; but, nevertheless, we did not take the law into our own hands, because we did not wish to bring about a revolution, nor to break up the Union; for I maintain that between submission to the decision of the constituted tribunals, and revolution or disunion, there is no middle ground; there is no ambiguous condition, half allegiance and half rebellion. And, sir, how futile, how very futile it is to admit the right of State interference, and then attempt to save it from the character of unlawful resistance by adding terms of qualification to the causes and occasions, leaving all these qualifications, like the case itself, in the discretion of the State governments! It must be a clear case, it is said, a deliberate case, a palpable case, a dangerous case. But then the State is still left at liberty to decide for herself what is clear, what is deliberate, what is palpable, what is dangerous. Do adjectives and epithets avail anything?

Sir, the human mind is so constituted that the merits of both sides of a controversy appear very clear and very palpable to those who respectively espouse them; and both sides usually grow clearer as the controversy advances. South Carolina sees unconstitu-

tionality in the tariff; she sees oppression there, also, and she sees danger. Pennsylvania, with a vision not less sharp, looks at the same tariff, and sees no such thing in it; she sees it all constitutional, all useful, all safe. The faith of South Carolina is strengthened by opposition, and she now not only sees, but *resolves* that the tariff is palpably unconstitutional, oppressive, and dangerous; but Pennsylvania, not to be behind her neighbors, and equally willing to strengthen her own faith by a confident asseveration, *resolves*, also, and gives to every warm affirmative of South Carolina a plain, downright, Pennsylvania negative. South Carolina, to show the strength and unity of her opinion, brings her assembly to a unanimity, within seven voices; Pennsylvania, not to be outdone in this respect any more than in others, reduces her dissentient fraction to a single vote. Now, sir, again, I ask the gentleman, What is to be done? Are these States both right? Is he bound to consider them both right? If not, which is in the wrong? or rather, which has the best right to decide? And if he, and if I, are not to know what the Constitution means, and what it is, till those two State legislatures, and the twenty-two others, shall agree in its construction, what have we sworn to when we have sworn to maintain it? I was forcibly struck, sir, with one reflection, as the gentleman went on in his speech. He quoted Mr. Madison's resolutions to prove that a State may interfere in a case of deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of a power not granted. The honorable member supposes the tariff law to be such an exercise of power; and that consequently a case has arisen in which the State may, if it see fit, interfere by its own law. Now it so happens, never-

theless, that Mr. Madison deems this same tariff law quite constitutional. Instead of a clear and palpable violation, it is, in his judgment, no violation at all. So that, while they use his authority for a hypothetical case, they reject it in the very case before them. All this, sir, shows the inherent futility — I had almost used a stronger word — of conceding this power of interference to the State, and then attempting to secure it from abuse by imposing qualifications of which the States themselves are to judge. One of two things is true, — either the laws of the Union are beyond the discretion and beyond the control of the States ; or else we have no Constitution of general government, and are thrust back again to the days of the Confederation.

Let me here say, sir, that if the gentleman's doctrine had been received and acted upon in New England in the times of the Embargo and non-intercourse, we should probably not now have been here. The government would very likely have gone to pieces and crumbled into dust. No stronger case can ever arise than existed under those laws ; no States can ever entertain a clearer conviction than the New England States then entertained ; and if they had been under the influence of that heresy of opinion, as I must call it, which the honorable member espouses, this Union would, in all probability, have been scattered to the four winds. I ask the gentleman, therefore, to apply his principles to that case ; I ask him to come forth and declare whether, in his opinion, the New England States would have been justified in interfering to break up the Embargo system under the conscientious opinions which they held upon it ? Had they a right to annul that law ? Does he admit or

deny? If what is thought palpably unconstitutional in South Carolina justifies that State in arresting the progress of the law, tell me whether that which was thought palpably unconstitutional also in Massachusetts would have justified her in doing the same thing. Sir, I deny the whole doctrine. It has not a foot of ground in the Constitution to stand on. No public man of reputation ever advanced it in Massachusetts in the warmest times, or could maintain himself upon it there at any time.

I wish now, sir, to make a remark upon the Virginia Resolutions of 1798. I cannot undertake to say how these resolutions were understood by those who passed them. Their language is not a little indefinite. In the case of the exercise by Congress of a dangerous power not granted to them, the resolutions assert the right, on the part of the State, to interfere and arrest the progress of the evil. This is susceptible of more than one interpretation. It may mean no more than that the States may interfere by complaint and remonstrance, or by proposing to the people an alteration of the Federal Constitution. This would all be quite unobjectionable, or it may be that no more is meant than to assert the general right of revolution, as against all governments, in cases of intolerable oppression. This no one doubts; and this, in my opinion, is all that he who framed the resolutions could have meant by it; for I shall not readily believe that he was ever of opinion that a State, under the Constitution and in conformity with it, could, upon the ground of her own opinion of its unconstitutionality, however clear and palpable she might think the case, annul a law of Congress, so far as it should operate on herself, by her own legislative power.

I must now beg to ask, sir, Whence is this supposed right of the States derived? Where do they find the power to interfere with the laws of the Union? Sir, the opinion which the honorable gentleman maintains is a notion founded in a total misapprehension, in my judgment, of the origin of this government, and of the foundation on which it stands. I hold it to be a popular government, erected by the people; those who administer it responsible to the people; and itself capable of being amended and modified, just as the people may choose it should be. It is as popular, just as truly emanating from the people, as the State governments. It is created for one purpose; the State governments for another. It has its own powers; they have theirs. There is no more authority with them to arrest the operation of a law of Congress than with Congress to arrest the operation of their laws. We are here to administer a Constitution emanating immediately from the people, and trusted by them to our administration. It is not the creature of the State governments. It is of no moment to the argument that certain acts of the State legislatures are necessary to fill our seats in this body. That is not one of their original State powers, a part of the sovereignty of the State. It is a duty which the people, by the Constitution itself, have imposed on the State legislatures, and which they might have left to be performed elsewhere, if they had seen fit. So they have left the choice of President with electors; but all this does not affect the proposition that this whole government — President, Senate, and House of Representatives — is a popular government. It leaves it still all its popular character. The governor of a State (in some of the States) is chosen, not directly by the

people, but by those who are chosen by the people for the purpose of performing, among other duties, that of electing a governor. Is the government of the State, on that account, not a popular government? This government, sir, is the independent offspring of the popular will. It is not the creature of State legislatures; nay, more, if the whole truth must be told, the people brought it into existence, established it, and have hitherto supported it for the very purpose, amongst others, of imposing certain salutary restraints on State sovereignties. The States cannot now make war; they cannot contract alliances; they cannot make, each for itself, separate regulations of commerce; they cannot lay imposts; they cannot coin money. If this Constitution, sir, be the creature of State legislatures, it must be admitted that it has obtained a strange control over the volitions of its creators.

The people, then, sir, erected this government. They gave it a Constitution, and in that Constitution they have enumerated the powers which they bestow on it. They have made it a limited government. They have defined its authority. They have restrained it to the exercise of such powers as are granted; and all others, they declare, are reserved to the States or the people. But, sir, they have not stopped here. If they had, they would have accomplished but half their work. No definition can be so clear as to avoid possibility of doubt; no limitation so precise as to exclude all uncertainty. Who, then, shall construe this grant of the people? Who shall interpret their will, where it may be supposed they have left it doubtful? With whom do they repose this ultimate right of deciding on the powers of the government? Sir, they have

settled all this in the fullest manner. They have left it with the government itself, in its appropriate branches. Sir, the very chief end, the main design for which the whole Constitution was framed and adopted was to establish a government that should not be obliged to act through State agency, or depend on State opinion and State discretion. The people had had quite enough of that kind of government under the Confederation. Under that system, the legal action, the application of law to individuals, belonged exclusively to the States. Congress could only recommend; their acts were not of binding force till the States had adopted and sanctioned them. Are we in that condition still? Are we yet at the mercy of State discretion and State construction? Sir, if we are, then vain will be our attempt to maintain the Constitution under which we sit.

But, sir, the people have wisely provided, in the Constitution itself, a proper, suitable mode and tribunal for settling questions of constitutional law. There are in the Constitution grants of powers to Congress, and restrictions on these powers. There are, also, prohibitions on the States. Some authority must, therefore, necessarily exist, having the ultimate jurisdiction to fix and ascertain the interpretation of these grants, restrictions, and prohibitions. The Constitution has itself pointed out, ordained, and established that authority. How has it accomplished this great and essential end? By declaring, sir, that "*the Constitution, and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.*"

This, sir, was the first great step. By this the

supremacy of the Constitution and laws of the United States is declared. The people so will it. No State law is to be valid which comes in conflict with the Constitution, or any law of the United States passed in pursuance of it. But who shall decide this question of interference? To whom lies the last appeal? This, sir, the Constitution itself decides also, by declaring "*that the judicial power shall extend to all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States.*" These two provisions cover the whole ground. They are, in truth, the keystone of the arch! With these it is a government; without them it is a confederation. In pursuance of these clear and express provisions, Congress established, at its very first session, in the judicial act, a mode for carrying them into full effect, and for bringing all questions of constitutional power to the final decision of the Supreme Court. It then, sir, became a government. It then had the means of self-protection; and but for this, it would, in all probability, have been now among things which are past. Having constituted the government and declared its powers, the people have further said that, since somebody must decide on the extent of these powers, the government shall itself decide; subject always, like other popular governments, to its responsibility to the people. And now, sir, I repeat, how is it that a State legislature acquires any power to interfere? Who or what gives them the right to say to the people, "We, who are your agents and servants for one purpose, will undertake to decide that your other agents and servants, appointed by you for another purpose, have transcended the authority you gave them!" The reply would be, I think, not impertinent, — "Who made

you a judge over another's servants? To their own masters they stand or fall."

Sir, I deny this power of State legislatures altogether. It cannot stand the test of examination. Gentlemen may say that, in an extreme case, a State government might protect the people from intolerable oppression. Sir, in such a case the people might protect themselves without the aid of the State governments. Such a case warrants revolution. It must make, when it comes, a law for itself. A nullifying act of a State legislature cannot alter the case, nor make resistance any more lawful. In maintaining these sentiments, sir, I am but asserting the rights of the people. I state what they have declared, and insist on their right to declare it. They have chosen to repose this power in the general government, and I think it my duty to support it, like other constitutional powers.

For myself, sir, I do not admit the competency of South Carolina, or any other State, to prescribe my constitutional duty, or to settle, between me and the people, the validity of laws of Congress for which I have voted. I decline her umpirage. I have not sworn to support the Constitution according to her construction of its clauses. I have not stipulated, by my oath of office or otherwise, to come under any responsibility, except to the people, and those whom they have appointed to pass upon the question whether laws supported by my votes conform to the Constitution of the country. And, sir, if we look to the general nature of the case, could anything have been more preposterous than to make a government for the whole Union, and yet leave its powers subject, not to one interpretation, but to thirteen or twenty-four interpre-

tations? Instead of one tribunal, established by all, responsible to all, with power to decide for all, shall constitutional questions be left to four-and-twenty popular bodies, each at liberty to decide for itself, and none bound to respect the decisions of others; and each at liberty, too, to give a new construction on every new election of its own members? Would anything with such a principle in it, or rather with such a destitution of all principle, be fit to be called a government? No, sir. It should not be denominated a Constitution. It should be called, rather, a collection of topics for everlasting controversy; heads of debate for a disputatious people. It would not be a government. It would not be adequate to any practical good, or fit for any country to live under.

To avoid all possibility of being misunderstood, allow me to repeat again, in the fullest manner, that I claim no powers for the government by forced or unfair construction. I admit that it is a government of strictly limited powers; of enumerated, specified, and particularized powers; and that whatsoever is not granted is withheld. But notwithstanding all this, and however the grant of powers may be expressed, its limit and extent may yet, in some cases, admit of doubt; and the general government would be good for nothing, it would be incapable of long existing, if some mode had not been provided in which those doubts, as they should arise, might be peaceably but authoritatively solved.

And now, Mr. President, let me run the honorable gentleman's doctrine a little into its practical application. Let us look at his probable *modus operandi*. If a thing can be done, an ingenious man can tell *how* it is to be done, and I wish to be informed *how* this

State interference is to be put in practice without violence, bloodshed, and rebellion. We will take the existing case of the tariff law. South Carolina is said to have made up her opinion upon it. If we do not repeal it (as we probably shall not), she will then apply to the case the remedy of her doctrine. She will, we must suppose, pass a law of her legislature declaring the several acts of Congress, usually called the tariff laws, null and void, so far as they respect South Carolina or the citizens thereof. So far, all is a paper transaction, and easy enough. But the collector at Charleston is collecting the duties imposed by these tariff laws. He, therefore, must be stopped. The collector will seize the goods if the tariff duties are not paid. The State authorities will undertake their rescue, the marshal, with his posse, will come to the collector's aid, and here the contest begins. The militia of the State will be called out to sustain the nullifying act. They will march, sir, under a very gallant leader; for I believe the honorable member himself commands the militia of that part of the State. He will raise the NULLIFYING ACT on his standard and spread it out as his banner! It will have a preamble, setting forth that the tariff laws are palpable, deliberate, and dangerous violations of the Constitution! He will proceed, with this banner flying, to the custom-house in Charleston,

“All the while,  
Sonorous metal blowing martial sounds.”<sup>1</sup>

Arrived at the custom-house, he will tell the collector that he must collect no more duties under any of the tariff laws. This he will be somewhat puzzled to say, by the way, with a grave countenance, considering

<sup>1</sup> See Milton's *Paradise Lost*, book i. lines 539, 540.

what hand South Carolina herself had in that of 1816. But, sir, the collector would not, probably, desist at his bidding. He would show him the law of Congress, the treasury instruction, and his own oath of office. He would say he should perform his duty, come what might.

Here would ensue a pause; for they say that a certain stillness precedes the tempest. The trumpeter would hold his breath awhile, and before all this military array should fall on the custom-house, collector, clerks, and all, it is very probable some of those composing it would request of their gallant commander-in-chief to be informed a little upon the point of law; for they have, doubtless, a just respect for his opinions as a lawyer, as well as for his bravery as a soldier. They know he has read Blackstone and the Constitution, as well as Turenne and Vauban.<sup>1</sup> They would ask him, therefore, something concerning their rights in this matter. They would inquire whether it was not somewhat dangerous to resist a law of the United States. What would be the nature of their offense, they would wish to learn, if they, by military force and array, resisted the execution in Carolina of a law of the United States, and it should turn out, after all, that the law *was constitutional*? He would answer, of course, Treason. No lawyer could give any other answer. John Fries,<sup>2</sup> he would

<sup>1</sup> Turenne was a famous general, and Vauban a great military engineer, both of whom added to the renown of France in the seventeenth century.

<sup>2</sup> Fries's Rebellion, in eastern Pennsylvania, early in 1799, was occasioned by the direct government tax laid July, 1798, and begun to be assessed January, 1799. This tax fell in Pennsylvania mainly on houses and lands. John Fries, an itinerant vendue-crier, the leader of the revolt, was sentenced to be

tell them, had learned that some years ago. How, then, they would ask, do you propose to defend us? We are not afraid of bullets, but treason has a way of taking people off that we do not much relish. How do you propose to defend us? "Look at my floating banner," he would reply; "see there the *nullifying law!*" Is it your opinion, gallant commander, they would then say, that if we should be indicted for treason, that same floating banner of yours would make a good plea in bar? "South Carolina is a sovereign State," he would reply. That is true; but would the judge admit our plea? "These tariff laws," he would repeat, "are unconstitutional, palpably, deliberately, dangerously." That may all be so; but if the tribunal should not happen to be of that opinion, shall we swing for it? We are ready to die for our country, but it is rather an awkward business, this dying without touching the ground! After all, that is a sort of hemp tax worse than any part of the tariff.

Mr. President, the honorable gentleman would be in a dilemma like that of another great general. He would have a knot before him which he could not untie. He must cut it with his sword. He must say to his followers, "Defend yourselves with your bayonets;" and this is war, — civil war.

Direct collision, therefore, between force and force, is the unavoidable result of that remedy for the revision of unconstitutional laws which the gentleman contends for. It must happen in the very first case to which it is applied. Is not this the plain result? To resist by force the execution of a law, generally, is treason. Can the courts of the United States take

hanged, but was pardoned by President Adams. McMaster's *History*, ii. 434; Schouler's *History*, i. 447.

notice of the indulgence of a State to commit treason? The common saying, that a State cannot commit treason herself, is nothing to the purpose. Can she authorize others to do it? If John Fries had produced an act of Pennsylvania annulling the law of Congress, would it have helped his case? Talk about it as we will, these doctrines go the length of revolution. They are incompatible with any peaceable administration of the government. They lead directly to disunion and civil commotion; and therefore it is that at their commencement, when they are first found to be maintained by respectable men and in a tangible form, I enter my public protest against them all.

The honorable gentleman argues that if this government be the sole judge of the extent of its own powers, whether that right of judging be in Congress or the Supreme Court, it equally subverts State sovereignty. This the gentleman sees, or thinks he sees, although he cannot perceive how the right of judging in this matter, if left to the exercise of State legislatures, has any tendency to subvert the government of the Union. The gentleman's opinion may be that the right *ought not* to have been lodged with the general government; he may like better such a Constitution as we should have under the right of State interference; but I ask him to meet me on the plain matter of fact. I ask him to meet me on the Constitution itself. I ask him if the power is not found there, clearly and visibly found there?

But, sir, what is this danger, and what are the grounds of it? Let it be remembered that the Constitution of the United States is not unalterable. It is to continue in its present form no longer than the people who established it shall choose to continue it.

If they shall become convinced that they have made an injudicious or inexpedient partition and distribution of power between the State governments and the general government, they can alter that distribution at will.

If anything be found in the national Constitution, either by original provision or subsequent interpretation, which ought not to be in it, the people know how to get rid of it. If any construction unacceptable to them be established so as to become practically a part of the Constitution, they will amend it at their own sovereign pleasure. But while the people choose to maintain it as it is, while they are satisfied with it and refuse to change it, who has given, or who can give, to the State legislatures a right to alter it, either by interference, construction, or otherwise? Gentlemen do not seem to recollect that the people have any power to do anything for themselves. They imagine there is no safety for them any longer than they are under the close guardianship of the State legislatures. Sir, the people have not trusted their safety in regard to the general Constitution to these hands. They have required other security, and taken other bonds. They have chosen to trust themselves, first, to the plain words of the instrument and to such construction as the government themselves, in doubtful cases, should put on their own powers, under their oaths of office, and subject to their responsibility to them; just as the people of a State trust their own State governments with a similar power. Secondly, they have reposed their trust in the efficacy of frequent elections, and in their own power to remove their own servants and agents whenever they see cause. Thirdly, they have reposed trust in the judicial power which, in order that

it might be trustworthy, they have made as respectable, as disinterested, and as independent as was practicable. Fourthly, they have seen fit to rely, in case of necessity or high expediency, on their known and admitted power to alter or amend the Constitution, peaceably and quietly, whenever experience shall point out defects or imperfections. And, finally, the people of the United States have at no time, in no way, directly or indirectly, authorized any State legislature to construe or interpret *their* high instrument of government; much less, to interfere, by their own power, to arrest its course and operation.

If, sir, the people in these respects had done otherwise than they have done, their Constitution could neither have been preserved, nor would it have been worth preserving. And if its plain provisions shall now be disregarded, and these new doctrines interpolated in it, it will become as feeble and helpless a being as its enemies, whether early or more recent, could possibly desire. It will exist in every State, but as a poor dependent on State permission. It must borrow leave to be, and will be no longer than State pleasure or State discretion sees fit to grant the indulgence and to prolong its poor existence.

But, sir, although there are fears, there are hopes also. The people have preserved this, their own chosen Constitution, for forty years, and have seen their happiness, prosperity, and renown grow with its growth and strengthen with its strength. They are now, generally, strongly attached to it. Overthrown by direct assault it cannot be; evaded, undermined, NULLIFIED, it will not be, if we and those who shall succeed us here as agents and representatives of the people shall conscientiously and vigilantly dis-

charge the two great branches of our public trust,—faithfully to preserve and wisely to administer it.


Mr. President, I have thus stated the reasons of my dissent to the doctrines which have been advanced and maintained. I am conscious of having detained you and the Senate much too long. I was drawn into the debate with no previous deliberation, such as is suited to the discussion of so grave and important a subject. But it is a subject of which my heart is full, and I have not been willing to suppress the utterance of its spontaneous sentiments. I cannot, even now, persuade myself to relinquish it without expressing once more my deep conviction that, since it respects nothing less than the Union of the States, it is of most vital and essential importance to the public happiness. I profess, sir, in my career hitherto, to have kept steadily in view the prosperity and honor of the whole country, and the preservation of our Federal Union. It is to that Union we owe our safety at home and our consideration and dignity abroad. It is to that Union that we are chiefly indebted for whatever makes us most proud of our country. That Union we reached only by the discipline of our virtues in the severe school of adversity. It had its origin in the necessities of disordered finance, prostrate commerce, and ruined credit. Under its benign influences these great interests immediately awoke as from the dead, and sprang forth with newness of life. Every year of its duration has teemed with fresh proofs of its utility and its blessings; and although our territory has stretched out wider and wider, and our population spread farther and farther, they have not outrun its protection or its benefits. It has been to us all a copious fountain of national, social, and personal happiness.

I have not allowed myself, sir, to look beyond the Union, to see what might lie hidden in the dark recess behind. I have not coolly weighed the chances of preserving liberty when the bonds that unite us together shall be broken asunder. I have not accustomed myself to hang over the precipice of disunion, to see whether, with my short sight, I can fathom the depth of the abyss below ; nor could I regard him as a safe counselor in the affairs of this government whose thoughts should be mainly bent on considering, not how the Union may be best preserved, but how tolerable might be the condition of the people when it shall be broken up and destroyed. While the Union lasts, we have high, exciting, gratifying prospects spread out before us for us and our children. Beyond that I seek not to penetrate the veil. God grant that in my day, at least, that curtain may not rise ! God grant that on my vision never may be opened what lies behind ! When my eyes shall be turned to behold for the last time the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union ; on States dissevered, discordant, belligerent ; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood ! Let their last feeble and lingering glance rather behold the gorgeous ensign of the republic, now known and honored throughout the earth, still full high advanced,<sup>1</sup> its arms and trophies streaming in their original lustre, not a stripe erased or polluted nor a single star obscured, bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as “What is all this worth ?” nor those other words of delusion and folly, “Liberty first and Union after-

<sup>1</sup> “Th’ imperial ensign, which, full high advanc’d.”

MILTON’S *Paradise Lost*, book i. line 653.

ards;” but everywhere, spread all over in characters living light, blazing on all its ample folds, as they float over the sea and over the land, and in every part under the whole heavens, that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart, — Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable!



# The Riverside Literature Series.

(Continued.)

Each regular single number, paper, 15 cents.

57. Dickens's Christmas Carol.\*\*
58. Dickens's Cricket on the Hearth.\*\*
59. Verse and Prose for Beginners in Reading.\*
- 60, 61. The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers. In two parts.†
62. John Fiske's War of Independence.§
63. Longfellow's Paul Revere's Ride, and Other Poems.\*\*
- 64, 65, 66. Tales from Shakespeare. Edited by CHARLES and MARY LAMB. In three parts. [Also, in one volume, linen, 50 cents.]
67. Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar.\* \*\*
68. Goldsmith's Deserted Village, The Traveller, etc.\*
69. Hawthorne's Old Manse, and A Few Mosses \*\*
70. A Selection from Whittier's Child Life in Poetry.\*\*
71. A Selection from Whittier's Child Life in Prose.\*\*
72. Milton's L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, Comus, Lycidas, etc.\*\*
73. Tennyson's Enoch Arden, and Other Poems.
74. Gray's Elegy, etc.; Cowper's John Gilpin, etc.
75. Scudder's George Washington.§
76. Wordsworth's On the Intimations of Immortality, etc.
77. Burns's Cotter's Saturday Night, and Other Poems.
78. Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield.§
79. Lamb's Old China, and Other Essays of Elia.
80. Coleridge's Rime of the Ancient Mariner, and Other Poems;  
Campbell's Lochiel's Warning, and Other Poems.\*
81. Holmes's Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table. (*Triple Number*, 45 cents; *linen*, 50 cents.)
82. Hawthorne's Twice-Told Tales.§§
83. George Eliot's Silas Marner.§
84. Dana's Two Years Before the Mast.§§
85. Hughes's Tom Brown's School Days.§§
86. Scott's Ivanhoe.§§
87. Defoe's Robinson Crusoe.§§
88. Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin.§§
89. Swift's Gulliver's Voyage to Lilliput.\*\*
90. Swift's Gulliver's Voyage to Brobdingnag.\*\*

Also, bound in linen: \* 25 cents. \*\* 11 and 63 in one vol., 40 cents; likewise 40 and 69, 55 and 67, 57 and 58, 70 and 71, 72 and 94, 89 and 90. † Also in one vol., 40 cents. § Double Number, paper, 30 cents; linen, 40 cents. §§ Quadruple Number, paper, 50 cents; linen, 60 cents.

## EXTRA NUMBERS.

- A American Authors and Their Birthdays. Programmes and Suggestions for the Celebration of the Birthdays of Authors. By A. S. ROE.
- B Portraits and Biographies of 20 American Authors.
- C A Longfellow Night. For Catholic Schools and Societies.
- D Literature in School. Essays by HORACE E. SCUDDER.
- E Harriet Beecher Stowe. Dialogues and Scenes.
- F Longfellow Leaflets. (Each a *Double Number*, 30 cents; *linen*, 40 cents.)
- G Whittier Leaflets. Poems and Prose Passages for Reading and Recitation.
- H Holmes Leaflets.
- O Lowell Leaflets.
- I The Riverside Manual for Teachers, containing Suggestions and Illustrative Lessons leading up to Primary Reading. By I. F. HALL.
- K The Riverside Primer and Reader. (*Special Number*.) In paper covers, with cloth back, 25 cents; in strong linen binding, 30 cents.
- L The Riverside Song Book. Containing 120 Classic American Poems set to Standard Music. (*Double Number*, 30 cents; *boards*, 40 cents.)
- M Lowell's Fable for Critics. (*Double Number*, 30 cents.)
- N Selections from the Writings of Eleven American Authors. (*Institute Number*.)

# The Riverside Literature Series.

(Continued.)

Each regular single number, paper, 15 cents.

## RECENT ISSUES.

91. Hawthorne's House of the Seven Gables. §§
92. Burroughs's A Bunch of Herbs, and Other Papers.
93. Shakespeare's As You Like It.\* \*\*
94. Milton's Paradise Lost. Books I.-III.\*\*
- 95, 96, 97, 98. Cooper's Last of the Mohicans. In four parts.  
(The four parts also bound in one volume, linen, 60 cents.)
99. Tennyson's Coming of Arthur, and Other Idylls of the King.
100. Burke's Conciliation with the Colonies. Edited by ROBERT ANDERSEN, A. M.\*
101. Homer's Iliad. Books I., VI., XXII., and XXIV. Translated by Alexander Pope.\*
102. Macaulay's Essays on Johnson and Goldsmith.\*
103. Macaulay's Essay on Milton.\*
104. Macaulay's Life and Writings of Addison.\*  
Nos. 102, 103, and 104 are edited by WILLIAM P. TRENT.
105. Carlyle's Essay on Burns. Edited by GEORGE R. NOYES.\*
106. Shakespeare's Macbeth. Edited by RICHARD GRANT WHITE, and furnished with Additional Notes by HELEN GRAY CONE.\* \*\*
- 107, 108. Grimms' German Household Tales. With Notes. In two parts. (The two parts also bound in one volume, linen, 40 cents.)
109. Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. Edited by WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY. §
110. De Quincey's Flight of a Tartar Tribe. Edited by MILTON HAIGHT TURK. With an Introduction, Notes, and Map.\*
111. Tennyson's Princess. Edited by W. J. ROLFE. With copious Notes and numerous Illustrations. (Double Number, 30 cents. Also, in Rolfe's Students' Series, cloth, to Teachers, 53 cents.)
112. Virgil's Æneid. Books I.-III. Translated by CHRISTOPHER PEARSE CRANCH. With an Introduction and Notes.
113. Poems from the Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by GEORGE H. BROWNE.\*\*
114. Old Greek Folk Stories. Told Anew by JOSEPHINE PRESTON PEABODY. With an Index of Mythology. Supplementary to Nos. 17 and 18, 22 and 23.\*
115. Browning's Pied Piper of Hamelin, and Other Poems.
116. Shakespeare's Hamlet. Edited by RICHARD GRANT WHITE, and furnished with Additional Notes by HELEN GRAY CONE. §
- 117, 118. Stories from the Arabian Nights. With an Introductory Note. (The two parts also bound in one volume, linen, 40 cents.)
119. Poe's Raven, The Fall of the House of Usher, and Other Poems and Tales. With an Introduction and Notes.\*\*
120. Poe's Gold-Bug, and Other Tales. With Notes.\*\*  
Nos. 119, 120 are edited by WILLIAM P. TRENT.
121. The Great Debate between Hayne and Webster: Hayne's Speech. With Introductions and Notes.\*\*
122. The Great Debate between Hayne and Webster: Webster's Reply to Hayne. With Introductions and Notes.\*\*  
Nos. 121, 122, are edited by LINDSAY SWIFT.
123. Lowell's Democracy, and Other Essays.\*\*

Also, bound in linen: \* 25 cents. \*\* 39 and 123 in one vol., 40 cents; likewise 72 and 94, 93 and 106, 113 and 42, 119 and 120, 121 and 122. § Double number, paper, 30 cents; linen, 40 cents. §§ Quadruple number, paper, 50 cents; linen, 60 cents.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY.































































































22275

C


1







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 896 492 5